THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

WILLIAM H. COBB

BV 4501 .C6
Cobb, William Henry, 1846-
1923.
The meaning of Christian
unity

OCT 25 1915

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY

WILLIAM H. COBB

There's a wideness in God's mercy
Like the wideness of the sea.

NEW YORK
THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

Copyright, 1915
By THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY

PREFACE

A time when half the Christian world is in discord that threatens destruction is a good time to search earnestly for the foundations of concord. Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

I purpose to ask, and to try to answer, two questions about Christian Unity; *what,* and *how.* The method of the book is not that of formal logic, but that of induction, which gathers the facts as it proceeds. The results, in briefest compass, are given here at the outset, and the reader who takes no interest in such a treatment may have the satisfaction of laying down the book with the preface.

Christian unity is the life of God in the lives of all his children.

The way to attain it is by the diligent use of the means of grace.

WILLIAM H. COBB.

Boston, April 9, 1915.

INTRODUCTION

Since God is the Father of all men, all men are brothers, even though they know it not, and even though they know him not. Since God is love, we ought also to love one another, and thus become worthy children of our Father. These are Christian truths, and the ideal they set before us is Christian unity, a conception as much broader than what is commonly called Church unity as the Lord's prayer is more catholic than the prayer of the Pharisee in the temple. We seek in vain for the key to Christian unity until we realize the relation of God to man and that of man to his brother man.

A leading obstacle to Christian unity is the popular habit of apprehending God as a great man up in the heavens, instead of as the Great Spirit working everywhere. The former notion gives birth to unconscious prejudices, as

delicate, but yet as effective, as the cords that imprisoned Gulliver among the Lilliputians. That sublime song in the opening chapter of the Bible:

> So God created man in his own image,
> In the image of God created he him,

is not to be reversed and belittled by man's attempt to create God in *his* image. But this is the inevitable result of limiting the Infinite and localizing the Omnipresent. The South Sea Islander invests a senseless fetish with his own passions; the Mohammedan projects into the sky the Fate which makes or mars him; the Jew, called to be an apostle of Divine liberty to all mankind, has too often narrowed his mission from inclusion to exclusion, and shaped his Creator accordingly; and even so, Judaism in the Christian Church beholds in its God the lineaments of Cephas or Apollos. Putting asunder what God hath joined together, it refuses to believe in a universal brotherhood to match a universal fatherhood.

Sectarian lines are like the radii of a circle, and these are intersected by a smaller concen-

tric circle.[1] For at the present moment, every so-called denomination of Christians is practically two denominations; each division of the army of the Lord divides again into two parts, dominated respectively by spirit and form. Within the outer circle of Christendom lies an inner circle, the company of those, however the sectors are named, who face the centre, looking to Christ for their orders; the rest face one another and perpetuate "our unhappy divisions." The hopeful feature is that in these latest generations the smaller circle is rapidly growing larger and its radii are growing fainter; so that those fragments of the body of Christ that give prominence to form are far less influential than was the case a century ago. And yet they belong to the body; the centripetal tendency is the stronger even in them. Indeed, there is some force in the contention, which we shall have to meet, that all Christians agree in certain essential forms as well as in an essential spirit. Earnest efforts are be-

[1] The coincidence with the diagram on p. 219 of Bishop William M. Brown's Level Plan of Church Union is purely accidental.

ing put forth to secure a general expression of concord in a few doctrines of the historic creed and in the two main historic sacraments. But the question arises, Where then shall we find room for such a saint as John Woolman, for instance, and for the Quakers as a whole? The writer neither belongs to that fellowship nor shares its peculiar views; but as every friend of Christ is a Christian, and is known by his fruits, no one can deny the Christianity of the Friends. We could better afford to lose all the theology of the Schoolmen than the Quaker poet's hymns:

> "Immortal Love, forever full."
> "Dear Lord and Father of mankind."
> "O Love ! O Light! our faith and sight
> Thy presence maketh one."

It might be replied that these Friends as well as other Christians must be educated into acceptance of those essential forms which belong to the true ideal of Christian unity; but the following treatise ventures to deny the major premise of that argument. It attempts to show that there are no such essential forms;

that Christian unity is independent of all forms, and lies below them like primitive rock below the later deposits. It would be wrong to assume at the outset the point to be proved; this Introduction asks only for an open mind, in view of the importance of the main thought of the book, provided it can be established.

Turning away now, in appearance only, from the theme in hand, we do well to ignore for the moment the distinction between sacred and secular, and to fix our thought upon the vast complexity of the world in which we have our being. It is customary to write Nature with a capital N, and to designate it by a feminine pronoun; but Christians do not really believe in such a mythological goddess. It is Our Father who

> Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
> Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees.

The one hundred and fourth Psalm sums up a miscellaneous catalog embracing (among other objects) rocks and waters, herbs and grass, birds and conies, lions and men,—with the exclamation, "Jehovah, how manifold are

Thy works!" Everything except sin is His work; this much, at least, is true in the theory of evolution, that the manifoldness of God is expressed in a constant progress of creation from simplicity to variety. The science of man, like the science of things, discloses the same law. It would be futile to expect humanity ever to return to simple savagery; modern life, the life of the family, of society, of business, of art, of literature, of science, of politics, of religion, is far too rich and full to be surrendered. The one God manifests himself in these and other ways, every one of them belonging to the Kingdom of God, and this plain fact brings us back at once to our subject. To illustrate it from the field of politics; President Wilson has been attempting to administer the government of the United States on Christian principles. One need not accept his political theories while admitting (as prominent opponents have frankly admitted) that his motto in dealing with complicated relations both at home and abroad is the Christian motto, "we seek not yours but

you." The fact that Christ will reign in politics when, and not before, that spirit pervades all the nations of earth, is simply axiomatic. Take another illustration, from the field of literature. The book of fiction that seems to have been most widely read in America during the last two years is "The Inside of the Cup." The reason is not far to seek. The book is full to overflowing of a genuine love for humanity. Testing it by that word of our Lord: "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father in heaven, the same is my brother," we realize that it rings true, and sounds a note in harmony with the gospel, while yet it stands apart from organized Christianity if indeed it does not openly oppose it. Here then is such another problem as was presented by the Quakers. Like causes produce like effects, up and down the whole range of human nature. Christian unity must comprehend the beating of the people's heart. That which lies deeper in us than creeds and rituals is stirred most profoundly by the Christian spirit as manifest in politics and in literature. It

is a spirit which finds us, as Coleridge said of the Bible. Those friends who are striving for the formal and confessional unity of the Church may perhaps secure the addition to their number of a few millions or even a few score millions of believers; but what have they for the great world of humanity outside their fold, for the hundreds of millions who are made kin by one touch of nature? Apparently they would relegate these to the nebulous spaces, the external segments of Christendom, whereas that place (as we aim to show) belongs to form and not to spirit. John said, "He followeth not us"; but Jesus said, "He that is not against us is for us."

We proceed at once to consider "The Meaning of Christian Unity," a subject which falls naturally into two parts, doctrine and duty. For the first, we seek to learn the mind of the Master; for the second, we ask how to embody his spirit in everyday living.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION v

PART I. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

CHAPTER

I THE CARDINAL PRECEPT 3

II THE LORD'S PRAYER 11

III PARALLEL TEACHINGS 26

IV THE UNDERLYING HARMONY OF CHRIST'S TEACHINGS 42

PART II. OUR CONSEQUENT DUTIES

I THE TRUE POINT OF VIEW 61

II THE HOME 72

III THE SCHOOL 89

IV THE CALLING 105

V THE STATE 125

VI THE BIBLE 141

VII THE LOCAL CHURCH 161

VIII THE CATHOLIC CHURCH 180

IX THE KINGDOM 204

X RETROSPECT 221

INDEX 237

PART I

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

CHAPTER I

THE CARDINAL PRECEPT

A GOOD book which ought to be better known is entitled *The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ* (London, 1892).[1] It is not superseded by Swete's recent discussion of the same portion of Scripture (London, 1913). Dr. Bernard finds that teaching in the gospel of John, chapters thirteen to seventeen, and he makes it very clear that this teaching is really central, for it closes Christ's teaching in the flesh and leads on to his teaching in the spirit. When we consider on the one hand the Sermon on the Mount and on the other hand the apostolic epistles, it is manifest that there is a wide diversity of doctrine between these two groups. The gospel of John (to regard not its date but its content) is the bridge that unites them, and these five chapters, especially, make the whole teaching continuous.

[1] By Thomas D. Bernard, author of The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament, the Bampton lecture for 1864.

The doctrines of the person of Christ, of faith in him, of the Holy Catholic Church, and many another, which we find in the epistles in a form somewhat developed, are present in germ in the discourses of the last evening. It is equally plain that the culmination of the whole is reached in that wonderful prayer which takes up into the most holy place these weak disciples and includes them and all other followers of Jesus in one goodly fellowship. "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; in order that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me." Certainly this prayer of Jesus is a teaching of the loftiest order; it is a program as well as a prayer; and if *noblesse oblige* it binds all who name the name of Christ to a sacred duty. The duty we shall consider hereafter; it is the doctrine that is before us now. There is a call here to Christian intelligence; "understandest thou what thou readest?"

It would be of merely curious interest to take up and discuss, one by one, the different conceptions that have been held of what Christ meant by the unity for which he made request of his Father. We are all indebted to the German commentators for patient and exhaustive researches into the history of interpretation; but few Americans will take the time to follow out all these mazes, and the book I am writing makes its chief appeal to practical people. Let it suffice to offer a brief summary in the form of contrasts. The passage refers either to the whole world or to a part of it. If to the whole world, then either (a) actually or (b) ideally. If to a part, then either (c) to Christians as distinct from the world, or (d) to Christians as acting on the world. These four possibilities we will take up in order.

A. *Christ declares the actual unity in him of all living souls, past, present, and future.*

This was an early form of the doctrine commonly known as Universalism. It taught that the redeeming grace of our Lord Jesus Christ

is actually possessed by every member of the human race. This doctrine is regarded by some as a fatal error, by others as a glorious truth. It is neither to be condemned out of hand, from prejudice against heresy, nor to be embraced at the start, from enthusiasm for humanity. No one can deny the grandeur of this conception, a whole world actually and already redeemed by Christ the Saviour. The truth of it is sought to be established by various lines of argument, but at present we are concerned with the seventeenth chapter of John, and it lies on the surface of that passage that "the world" is in manifest opposition to the disciples for whose unity the Saviour prays; the two cannot coincide without a great strain, not to say twist, of interpretation. The world knows not God (verse 25) and hates the disciples (verse 14), who are not of the world (verse 16). The passage may well be consistent with that other and prevalent form of Universalism which adjourns to the future the unity of the race in Christ, but

hardly with the theory of a unity then and now present.

B. *Humanity as a whole is in Christ ideally, as the oak is wrapped up in the acorn.*

No one would say that the oak is actually in the acorn, much less that the entire population of all the generations of mankind was literally present in the first man. But as the seed of Adam develops into all the races and kindreds of the globe, so (it is said) Christ is the seed of a new humanity, a humanity perfect and universal in the idea of God from all eternity. When Jesus prays that all may be one, it is the ideal humanity which he has in mind.

This philosophical conception harmonizes well with the Greek speculations that have swayed Christendom through the greater portion of the Christian era. They played an important part in the earnest controversies of the schoolmen, but they have little practical value today. Fifty years ago a few theologians were still contending that the generic

race was in Adam, and that the generic race is in Christ, but our own generation is soundly converted to the specific rather than the generic view, to men and women on the earth, as opposed to an ideal humanity in the air. Jesus himself was a brother man of the order of the Good Samaritans, not a Platonic philosopher, and it is safe to say that those who find a metaphysical race-unity in this chapter of John, read it into the text artificially instead of drawing it out naturally.

C. *The passage refers to the elect, a definite number known to God and set to testify against a hostile world.*

This theory is consistent with itself, and with the phrases already quoted from our chapter; compare also verse 9:

> "I pray for them; I pray not for the world."

It is so easy and natural an interpretation from the standpoint of human pride and bigotry that its long prevalence is not to be wondered at. But its days are numbered if not over; the Christ of the gospels has been exalted

in all the power of his redeeming love, and the Christian consciousness simply refuses to adopt the narrow conception which this Calvinistic theory favors. As an exegesis of our cardinal precept, though it may seem to be favored by a few expressions in the context, it shatters against others of a large and liberal scope; as verse 21, "that the world may believe," verse 23, "that the world may know." We come then to

D. *The program of Christ is the transformation of the whole world by a united brotherhood.* This differs from (a) and (b) as a dynamic differs from a static force. That which (a) declares to be a fact appears to (d) a desirable goal. And are we not bound to confess, even in the judgment of charity: "we see not yet all things put under him"; "there remaineth yet much land to be possessed"?

That which (b) holds as a concept of the mind becomes with (d) a task to be achieved; note the phrases just quoted: "that the world *may* believe," etc. And is not the latter view,

rather than the former, in harmony with the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles? Just as brotherhood differs from warfare, (d) differs from (c); while it was true in Christ's day that friendship with the world was enmity with God, it was not to be so always, for Christ himself foresaw the spread of his gospel over all the earth.

It is the mark of a narrow theory to account for some of the facts in hand; it is the mark of a true theory to account for all the facts in hand. When we thrust this conception of Christian unity that we have called (d) in among other great teachings of Christ, it will be seen whether or not it groups them about itself in harmony and order.

CHAPTER II

THE LORD'S PRAYER

It is a good custom, in some of the churches where the invocation is closed with the Lord's Prayer, for the leader to make very definite the point of transition to that prayer; for otherwise the congregation is apt to leave out the first two words; and these I am inclined to regard as the best of all. How catholic they are! It was a Jew who taught us to say "Our Father," but Gentiles also can plead: "Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us and Israel acknowledge us not." Mohammedan children can join from the heart in saying, with Jewish and Christian children: "Our Father, who art in heaven." And surely no Christian will pretend that when we step outside the circle of these three great religions which already acknowledge the one Heavenly Father, there is any barrier of his raising that would forbid

the appeal to his fatherhood from any child whom he has created in his image, or that would justify such exclusiveness on the part of any disciple. We rise on the wings of that simple word *Our,* and the prospect covers the whole field of humanity, and kindles hope in a vital unity of all our race in God the one Father. We see new depths of meaning in the word so often lightly spoken, "fellowmen":

> "For so the whole round world is every way
> Bound with gold chains about the feet of God."

But leaving these general considerations, we do well to examine the separate petitions and to consider what it is that we pray for in each. (Cf. Maurice, The Lord's Prayer, London, 1870).

Hallowed be thy name.

Primitive prayers are such as those rejected by Solomon at Gibeon (I Kings 3:11); prayers for long life, and riches, and the life of one's enemies. Not so naïvely, but yet as effectually, modern man is wont to put self first and foremost in the things he seeks from God. The point to be noticed here is that

self, under whatever disguises, always divides men, while the first petition of the Lord's Prayer unites them. If I ask for the life of my enemies, and they ask for mine, and both prayers are granted, the world is on its way to destruction. To covet my neighbor's goods is as plainly divisive. There are only two kinds of people in the world; those whose chief desire is to get and those whose chief desire is to give, the dividers and the uniters. The one power that is adequate to keep us steadfastly in this latter class is the vision of the true God, whose name is Love. In the hallowing of that name, we are lifted as by a celestial tide, and floated away from all that is selfish and narrow and low; the impulse to get is melted out of us; the governing purpose of life becomes godlike, that is, loving; and we see with new eyes—with our Father's eyes—the members of his great family. The most opposite classes and conditions of men meet in this petition; on the one hand, it voices the aspiration of the sublimest mystics; on the other, it is painfully pronounced in the

last breath of the street waif whom Dickens has drawn for us in the character of poor Joe. Our Lord, at the day of judgment, will say to those of us to whom he can say it truthfully: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." And that is to hallow his name and the name of his Father.

Thy kingdom come.

At the time of this writing, there is deep and wide-spread attention, throughout our land, to the things of the kingdom of heaven. From far and near come the good tidings that pastors and churches of every name are exhorting one another to lay aside every weight, and look up to God for his blessing, and gladly spend and be spent to win souls to Christ. It is difficult to keep pace with the triumphs of the cross of Christ at home and abroad; and every advance is marked by the breaking down of middle walls of partition, and by the pervasive spread of Christian brotherhood. The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

When Paul wrote those words, Rome was ruling the world with a rod of iron; Paul's words are no more contradicted by the recent outburst of militarism in Europe than by the history of his own time. "Force and right rule the world; force till right is ready." He is faithful that promised: the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom shall be given unto the people of the saints of the Most High. Any man with a conscience ought to know that war is contrary to the kingdom of God, and that peace is the fruit of the kingdom. It was well for America to celebrate the first hundred years of peace with her ancient foe, on the longest frontier in the world. The Christian hosts of every land march on together to gain the world for him whose right it is to reign. And we must not forget to measure our success by the standard which Christ himself has supplied in the next petition of his prayer:

Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven.

Nothing less extensive than the earth, nothing less intensive than the will of our Father

in heaven, can interpret his kingdom. We might divide the world into two classes on another principle from that mentioned before, namely into those whose ruling motive is "Thy will be done," and those whose ruling motive is "My will be done." We must be honest enough to acknowledge, however, that from the Christian standpoint this division does not separate the sheep from the goats. For all sincere religion is grounded on self-renunciation; Brahmanists and Buddhists give more perfect examples of such a surrender than Christians. But everything depends on the noun represented by the pronoun *Thy*. Who is this that demands supremacy over my will? Goodness and greatness alone will not authorize it; if the angel Gabriel makes such a claim, I can match my immortality against his, while he himself must confess, "I am thy fellow-servant." We are fellow-servants of whom, then? of the dark and stern powers which the sinful imaginations of men have projected into the heavens as their gods? of the empty Nirvana of Buddhism, or the equally empty

Substance of Pantheism? Nay, rather, we must assume that all who are praying the Lord's Prayer with us have begun at the beginning, have learned Our Father's name and learned to hallow it. It is as foolish as wicked to be rebellious children when Love is at the head of the family. With sweet and glad submissiveness we yield our wills to the King of Love, our Shepherd.

Yet this is not all of the petition, and resignation is the least part of it. "In earth as it is in heaven" is a summons to the fullest and purest activity of which a soul is capable. "In earth" tells us that the field is the world; "in heaven" holds up the loftiest conceivable standard as the goal for all the populations of that field. It is Christian unity which is aimed at in this petition of the Lord's Prayer; it is Christian people who are the agents through whom the Lord is to realize his ideal; an ideal imperfectly attained until you and I are in harmony with our neighbors, and also with our enemies, and also with the races that we have despised, and also with the poor that

we have slighted. What a solvent for every social problem that presents itself to us! "How do they feel about this in heaven?" As in heaven, so in earth.

Give us this day our daily bread.

Political Economy, sometimes called the dismal science, would deserve that name if it fell to exploiting the weak and poor for the sake of the rich and strong. When we reach the word *us* in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the question presses: "how many of us?" Is it to be the fittest who survive or is mercy to rejoice against judgment? Christianity reaches its social climax in the motto: "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves." Each petition of the prayer links back to the opening address,[1] and so when we pray we say: *"Our Father,* give us this day our daily bread." Here are three pronouns in the first person plural and all must be co-extensive; but how seldom we realize that! We

[1] A familiar hymn by Rev. Charles G. Ames, beginning "Father in heaven, hear us today," brings this out finely.

are catholic enough in theory to admit the reference of the word *our* to all humanity; but in practise do we not often mean: "Give our family their daily bread"? Praying thus, we put asunder what God hath joined together.

Not long ago, our hearts were stirred by a sore famine in Japan. This last year we have sent great shiploads of food to relieve famine in Belgium. At almost any time, there is a sore famine in India. At almost any time there is keen suffering somewhere in our homeland for want of bread. Well may our hearts bleed at the gaunt and ghastly forms of distress among the children of our Father in the four quarters of the world; well may each of us bear them in his arms of faith, and identify himself with them, and present them at the throne of grace, saying: "Our Father, give us our bread. Thou hast all power, and thy name is Love. Touch with divine compassion the hearts of Christian people, that they may be Christians indeed, and may share with these multitudes who faint and are scattered abroad like shepherdless sheep."

No one can pray that prayer sincerely without trying to help. There is no dispute about Christian unity among those who are working together for the relief of God's poor.

The prophet tells of a famine, not of bread but of the word of the Lord. The hunger of the soul is the direst need known to our poor human nature. One who prays the Lord's Prayer will be fervent in supplication for the prodigals who have only husks to eat. He will cry: "Thou art the bread of life; Lord, evermore give *us* this bread!" One who looks on the faces and hears the voices of men who but a little while ago were famishing miserably in sin and shame, but who have tasted of the bread of life and are rejoicing in the Saviour of the world, will find it better to see and hear them than even to read the same things in Harold Begbie's books. The absolute oneness of these ransomed souls with their refined Christian teachers is a cross-section of the great cable of love which is stretching around the world to bind together all the children of God in Christian unity.

And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.

Embedded in the Lord's Prayer we seem to encounter the rule of three. Divine and human forgiveness are compared and even equated. If repetition of the formula had not blunted our perceptions, the result would plunge us into hopeless gloom. It makes the case worse when we realize that this is not a statement but a prayer; so be, instead of so are, our debts to his pardon; that is imprecating perdition upon ourselves. The Lord, who taught us the prayer, willeth not that any should perish; it must be that we have failed to understand him. And no marvel; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are God's ways higher than our ways. The average man is an exacter, not a forgiver. He holds his fellow-men to every obligation; he marks their trespasses and believes it manly to resent them. The Psalmist asks: "If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, O Lord, who should stand?" and then he adds very beautifully: "but there is forgiveness with thee."

That average man has been wresting the Lord's Prayer, saying in spirit if not in words: "my Father, forgive me my debts." Had he opened his heart to the surging of the Holy Spirit, the sins against himself would have coalesced with his own, and like the high priest of Israel he would have sent them all away into a land of forgetfulness. There is no praying this prayer if we determine to abide in isolation; "forgive us" means "forgive all sinners everywhere." It is just because God is love that he delivers us from our selfish prayers and forgives us far more than we forgive. The Holy Spirit in us leaves no room for unforgivingness; and here the parallel in Luke will clinch the truth: "Forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us." Is it not clear that thus we keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace?

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

It is customary to divide this into two petitions in order to make out the sacred number

seven; but we must not charge our Lord with tithing mint, anise and cummin. There is no good reason for stopping short of the full sentence. The previous petition related to the past, this relates to the future. The past we cannot blot out, but infinite mercy can make it as though it had never been. That mercy we implore; and it alone can shield us for the future, delivering us from staining its clean leaves, keeping us from temptation and from all evil, whether or not we regard it as summed up in a personal head. God leads us, and temptation is in the way; but we pray that he will not "bring us into," and leave us under, its power; "nay, rather," that he will deliver his darling from the power of the dog. Our wills are weak as water, but he is almighty; our wills are ours to make them his. It was a true feeling in the ancient church which led to the insertion just here of the doxology from I Chronicles 29: 11.

Does not every Christian feel, when he offers this closing petition, that he is joining with all God's children everywhere? Temp-

tation is common to all; all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Evil has put upon all men the ugly mark of the beast. When God pours upon us the spirit of grace and of supplication, we become intercessors. In our small measure, we are made partakers of the sufferings of Christ, who bore upon his soul the burden of the sins of the world. In his spirit we put up our common prayer: "That it may please thee to bring into the way of truth *all* such as have erred and are deceived: we beseech thee to hear us, good Lord." "That it may please thee to have mercy upon *all* men: we beseech thee to hear us, good Lord." "Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen."

When this petition, and when the Lord's Prayer as a whole, shall be offered everywhere in sincerity and truth, Christian unity will be an accomplished fact. In however miscellaneous a congregation the Lord's Prayer is about to be offered, the exhortation has its fullest

force: let us *unite* in prayer. And since prayer is the highest form of divine service, all who are one in prayer are one in God.

CHAPTER III

PARALLEL TEACHINGS

A. The Beatitudes. We can be brief here, confining ourselves to two or three examples, for the intimate relation of the Beatitudes to the Lord's Prayer has long been a commonplace of exegesis.

When the man who is proud of his own achievements enters the school of Christ, he is sent to the lowest child's class; he has to begin with the alphabet: "Blessed are the poor in spirit." A proud Christian is as inconsistent as a square circle. Now the bearing of this upon our general subject is plain. It is the very nature of pride to separate; it is the very nature of humility to unite. It is not true that if all men were proud, all would stand together; for each proud man is a lonely iceberg in a desolate

sea. But it is true that if all were humble, all would stand together. Each would vie with each in seeking his neighbor's good; each would esteem others better than himself; and all would unite in giving glory to God; it would be the unity of heaven. Although therefore it looks at first like restriction when Jesus confines his new society to the poor in spirit (Matt. 5: 3; "the kingdom of heaven belongs to them"), it is in truth the fullest comprehension; for it gathers together all men on the platform where God made them to stand; not abasing them, but lifting them up to the plane of the seraphim, who veil their faces before Our Father. From this viewpoint, the only obstacle to Christian unity is the pride that contradicts the very essence of Christianity.

The Beatitudes run through the whole gamut of the Christian virtues, and end on this same ground-tone (verse 10: the kingdom of heaven belongs to them). This is because the humble, who seek not their own, but give all the glory to God, are identical with those

who will endure persecution rather than lower the standard of righteousness.

Described in other terms they are the pure in heart, and they see God. The promise here, though put in the future tense, is not restricted to future time; it is true here and now, and it is an eternal truth. To take a parallel case: suppose it is said, "if you are faithful, you will please God": that means not only in the heavenly hereafter but all the way thither. So here: the pure in heart always see God, and no one else can see him, save dimly through a clouded medium. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. There is no Pharisaic exclusiveness in this, for the door to purity of heart is open to all, and Christ is the way. While all the children of Our Father must pray, "forgive us our debts," the inspiring hope waves like a banner before all: "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall bear the image of the heavenly."

Our Lord Jesus has found and provided the

sure way to bring all humanity into one brotherhood; its success he foretells in still another beatitude. "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Among the many causes for astonishment at Jesus, when he had ended the Sermon on the Mount, none was more overwhelming than this promise to the meek. The *words,* to be sure, were in an ancient psalm, but in Christ's time they were not taken seriously either by the leaders or by the common people. The meek were everywhere trodden down and despised. It was power and success that were glorified; the popular hero was the fierce zealot who would break the Roman yoke by force. Only a dreamer could have imagined that the meek were to conquer the earth; but this dreamer was prepared to wait; in our day, to those who look below the agitated surface, the world is growing towards his dream, and that conquest has become probable, even judging the future solely by the past. Longfellow, in the Saga of King Olaf, caught the vital issues of the conflict.

"I am the war-god; I am the thunderer.
Meekness is weakness, Strength is triumphant.
Thou art a god too, O Galilean!
And thus single-handed Unto the combat,
Gauntlet or gospel, Here I defy thee."

The answer to the challenge is heard in the voice of St. John, the beloved disciple.

"It is accepted, The angry defiance,
But not with the weapons Of war that thou wieldest!
Peace-cry for war-cry! Patience is powerful;
Stronger than steel Is the sword of the Spirit;
Greater than anger Is love, and subdueth."

Many plans for Christian union have been put before the Christian public, only to prove ineffectual; Christ's own plan, on the contrary, is thoroughly feasible; a union in the spirit of the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes. Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday and today and forever; thus we have the best reason to expect that all his teachings will be found harmonious with those already examined. This expectation is justified when we pass to

B. The Parables. The seven in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew are often called distinctively the parables of the kingdom of heaven. The truth is, however, that the same

name may be fitly applied to the score and more found elsewhere. It is also true that both these and those appeal to no special class or race or time; they are as universal as the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer.

Consider for a moment the parables of grace, such as the three that form the fifteenth chapter of Luke. In the West as naturally as in the East we sing, "I was a wandering sheep." In the twentieth century as in the first, hearts are melted by the love that goes out into the mountain; indeed, the human heart was never made to resist the persistent battery of that yearning, divine love. Unity is lacking to the *flock* of Christ, if ninety-nine tribes of men are gathered into it but one remains unreached; "other sheep I have," "them also I must bring," "there shall be one flock, one shepherd." Unity is more palpably lacking to the *diadem* of Christ if nine races, like silver coins, form a broken circlet about his brow, broken because one is lost; the diligent search must go on till the cry ascends: "rejoice with me"—"When beneath Messiah's sway,

Every nation, every clime, Shall the gospel call obey."

What shall we say, then, of the *family* of Christ when the ratio is one to one? when a full half of humanity are still among the husks and the swine? To chatter about ceremonies and vestments, dogma and polity, instead of heeding the summons of the Master: "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead"; "Go ye into *all the world* and preach the gospel to *every creature,*" is to be fiddling while Rome is burning.

Turn from the parables of grace to those of judgment. On the surface, these may seem quite out of harmony with the universality of the gospel. But when we dig below the surface, the all-embracing love of God shines in them like the gleam of gems in a mine. If divine judgment has ever loomed up threateningly, it is in the story of the barren fig-tree. Yet Jesus is the vine-dresser, and the Jewish nation is only one tree in the great vineyard, which is his kingdom; and the plea of the intercessor is effectual in warding off the threat-

ening doom. He who bade us love our enemies set us a royal example, for the type of the vine-dresser found its antitype in the cry from the cross: "Father, forgive them." Let the reader ask his own heart if it be not true, that herein we have the universal solvent that can melt all humanity and blend it together into one brotherhood that will crown our Jesus lord of all. I cannot resist the temptation to quote at this point from another of the good books which ought to be better known, James Stirling's recent volume, *Christ's Vision of the Kingdom of Heaven.* (London, 1913. p. 371):

"What was the plain, literal message of the vine-dresser's intercession to those who first heard this parable? It was that Jesus Christ had prayed for the whole nation, and that its period of probation had been prolonged in answer to his intercession and his work. The people amongst whom Jesus lived and moved were ignorant of the Divine edict of removal; but they were also ignorant of the other truth that he whom society avoided had by his prayer stayed the execution of the sentence. There is pathos in the mother praying for her sleeping child; there is deeper pathos in the Redeemer's intercession between a slumbering nation and the sentence of judgment. How often may the prayer 'Let it alone' have risen from the Redeemer's soul, on the cold mountain, in the lonely night, or when town and city repulsed his overtures of love with rage and scorn!"

Yet more plain and convincing is the lesson of those parables which depict the expansion of the kingdom of heaven under such figures as that of the seed growing secretly, that of the mustard seed, and that of the leaven. Confining ourselves to the last, it is easy to refute once more that ancient perversion (still clung to by a few) which sees in the leaven the image of a corruption that is to fill the church of Christ until the whole mass has become so degenerate that the Lord himself will descend in the clouds of heaven to gather his elect out of the sinking ship. Suffice it to say *negatively,* that this view can no more be proved from the fact that leaven is elsewhere an image of sin, than the lion of the tribe of Judah, in the fifth chapter of Revelation, can be proved identical with the roaring lion in the fifth chapter of I Peter; and *positively,* that the mustard seed and the leaven are manifestly twin parables of the kingdom of heaven; and even as the one represents the marvellous growth of that kingdom as visible to the outward eye, so the other most naturally sets forth

the invisible power of the kingdom to penetrate and transform the whole mass of humanity. It is the leaven, not the meal, to which Jesus likens the kingdom of heaven. This natural exegesis is vindicated by the conquests of Immanuel in human history. On the one hand, the corn of wheat that he planted has brought forth abundant fruit in the hundreds of millions who call him Lord; on the other, the thoughts of the human heart, the judgments of the mind, the passions of the soul, the customs of the race, age by age (for the swirling eddies of the surface do not mark the trend of the age-current) are becoming transmuted and elevated into conformity with the mind of Christ, even as leaven transmutes and elevates dough. The parable of the leaven is a sure word of prophecy, fulfilling itself in the past, and to be fulfilled progressively till the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

A passing reference is due here to two important books: Dr. Storrs's Lowell lectures, "The Divine Authority of Christianity Indi-

cated by its Historical Effects"; this shows what has been; and Canon Fremantle's Bampton lectures, "The World as the Subject of Redemption"; this shows what is and is to be.

C. Separate sayings. A single thread connects all these pearls, namely, that word of the Samaritan woman: "This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."

(1) *I must be about my Father's business.* Many would say that since we are considering the teachings of Jesus, we should leave out this first recorded utterance; for it was spoken when he was twelve years old, without the least intention of "teaching." But in any case it is an admirable motto for all disciples to adopt and follow, and it has had, and will have, no small part in the saving of the world. The modern insistence on permeating business with religion and religion with business is altogether praiseworthy, and it issues, like a stream from a fountain, out of this same consecration of all to God, wherein Jesus led the way, teaching by example. The word "business" is used here in no technical sense; indeed,

Jesus did not use it at all. What he said was "the things of my Father." It was almost as though he had said, "I belong to my Father."

It is strange that so many people take credit to themselves for giving a tenth of their income and a seventh of their time to God's business, not perceiving that the other nine-tenths is borrowed money, the other six-sevenths borrowed time. Even to say with Peter, "See, we have left *all* and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?" is equivalent to saying: "If we have left all, how much have we remaining?" The only true position to take is the frank acknowledgment that not one of us has a right to say *mine* of any possession. We *may* go about some earthly business; we *must* be about our Father's business. And since he has made us all to differ, a moment's reflection shows that any lower governing purpose in life than Christ's leads to constant clashing of wills, while the pursuit of this purpose results in a world like the solar system, with a maximum of variety blending in harmonious unity.

(2) *Follow me and I will make you fishers of men.*

Jesus said this to his first disciples; he says it still to all his disciples. When Andrew and Peter, James and John, began to follow him, the leaven began to work in the lump; or, which is the same thing, the net began to enclose a multitude of fishes. Even in our own day there are as good fish in the sea as ever were caught, and they *will* be caught, for every year the disciples are gathering them in by hundreds of thousands, "pure fish to sweet life enticing." [1] Some one explains why fishing rather than hunting has furnished us with Christian emblems by remarking that the hunter *drives* his game, the fisherman *draws* his game. Now that our Lord is ascended on high, it is not by the exercise of miraculous power, but through the ministry of us, his humble fishermen, that he fulfils his great promise: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." He has found the secret of winning all the world into union

[1] From an early Christian hymn.

with one another, by first drawing them into union with himself.

(3) *It is more blessed to give than to receive.*

This is that word of Jesus which is preserved to us in Paul's address to the Ephesian elders; it is significant that we are bidden to remember it, for it runs athwart the tendencies of the natural man. The most obvious reason why the world of today is out of harmony, is that men strive to get rather than to give. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts?" It is a childish notion, that if people could inhabit a beautiful place called heaven, and have their every desire gratified, they would be perfectly happy. Jesus knew human nature better. It is true, we sometimes use the word *happiness* to denote these pleasures of a lower order that flow in upon us, but in that case we must keep clear the distinction between happiness and joy which Dr. Bushnell made so plain. Joy is a synonym for the blessedness of which Christ here speaks; it is the

wellspring that constantly overflows in giving, and by that very act refreshes the giver's heart. What would happen if we were all givers; not by impulse but by deliberate plan? Why, we should give the best we have; the knowledge of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. We should be eager to bestow freely the pearl of great price which we have so freely received. If A would not take it from B, he might from C; thus, by and by, the earth would be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea, and the hearts of all would beat in unison with the heart of Christ.

(4) *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*

The Jews have always been wont to recite as the fundamental precept of their law that passage in Deuteronomy which is called the *Shema* from its opening word: "Hear (Hebrew, shema), O Israel; the Lord thy God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," etc. But it required an insight of genius that could pierce through a multitude of ceremonial precepts to their kernel, and it required the boldness of him

who taught with authority, to place beside that sacred Shema as its co-equal and fellow this law of love to the neighbor. "And who is my neighbor?" asked a certain lawyer, wishing to justify himself, that is, to justify his exclusiveness. Now the point of Christ's answer, in the story of the Good Samaritan, is that according to custom, which is stronger than law, the Jews of that day were having no dealings with the Samaritans. Christ turns the lawyer's question end for end, bidding him ask rather: "to whom can I be neighbor?" teaching him to bind up the wounds of his bitterest foes, and thus interpret love in terms of life.

Our age applauds the coupling together of these two great commandments; and better still, it has caught from the Lord Jesus the enthusiasm of humanity. That spirit will conquer—is conquering—the world, and just so fast and so far as it prevails, the world becomes one; there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.

CHAPTER IV.

THE UNDERLYING HARMONY OF CHRIST'S TEACHINGS

STILL another of the good books which deserve to be more widely read is *The Prophets and the Promise*.[1] Not "promises," for Professor Beecher shows that one great promise runs through the entire divine revelation. The content of that promise is the proclamation of God's kingdom, culminating in Jesus Christ, its anointed king. At Emmaus, our Lord began from Moses and *all* the prophets, and interpreted to the disciples in *all* the Scriptures the things concerning himself. The original promise to Abraham, that his seed should bring blessing to all nations, is in constant development throughout the Old Testament. The seed of that promise reaches its

[1] By the late Willis J. Beecher. It is, for substance, the Stone lectures given at Princeton Seminary in 1902–3 and published in New York in 1905.

perfect flower in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As all previous history looked forward to this king of the world, so the growth of his kingdom rules all subsequent history. As in the old dispensation, so in the new, the sins of men are ever thwarting and deferring the consummation of God's kingdom, but the one eternal promise shines through all, like the bow in the cloud. It cannot be shaken; it abides forever. As Paul puts it in his letter to the Ephesians, God has made known to us the mystery of his will, according to the good pleasure which he purposed in his Son, unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth.

There we read the meaning of Christian unity, expressed most tersely yet most profoundly. In Christ it centres; from Christ it radiates; all who are in Christ are in Christian unity.

Reverting for a moment to the cardinal precept, let us listen to one whom all schools like

to quote (Godet's commentary on John 17:21):

"The question is not only, as is often supposed, of the union of Christians among themselves, but above all, of the union which is the basis of this, that of the body of believers with Christ, and through him with God himself. This sublime unity it is, which Jesus in what follows contrasts with that of the world. 'That they also may be (one?) in us.' The idea . . . does not imperatively require this word (one). It is by being *in* Christ, and through him *in* God (*'in us'*), that believers find themselves living in each other. That which separates them is what they have of self in their views and will; that which unites them is what they have of Christ, and thereby of the divine, in them. It is clear that this dwelling of Christ, and therefore of God, in them, is the work of the Spirit, who alone has the power to cast down the barriers between personalities without confounding them."

We have been considering the teachings of Christ by selected samples; cutting them off perpendicularly, so to speak, and noting the identity of their structure, whether in the prayer which the Lord himself prayed, or in the prayer which he taught to us, or in the Beatitudes, or in the parables, or in certain isolated sayings; each and all set before us the great ideal, that even as our Master is one in the Father, so all the world is to be one in him, according to the promise given to the

father of the faithful. Our thought will now take a horizontal direction, and pass through the main body of Christ's teaching in Matthew, following the clue just gained, the idea of the kingdom of God.

In 4: 17 we read that Jesus began to preach —that is, to announce as a herald—: "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Now the kingdom of heaven is precisely the kingdom of God, whose promise had illuminated the ages from Abraham down. If one takes the slight trouble to look up, in a concordance, the references in the New Testament to "the kingdom of heaven" and "the kingdom of God," he cannot fail to perceive that these two are one. Humanity, lost by sin, redeemed by Christ, constitutes the kingdom of heaven, or of God. This kingdom is the subject of the next three chapters of Matthew, the Sermon on the Mount, which includes the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, already examined. The identity of the kingdom with the promise that pervades the Old Testament is established by 5: 17–19, and the main theme of the ser-

mon is announced in 5:20: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Jesus had to tear down the old house to replace it with the new; or, to use his own figure, the new wine would burst the old wine-skins. The kingdom of formal ceremonies and whited sepulchres must yield to the kingdom of truth and love. Hence the contrasts that follow in chapter 5: "it hath been said," "but I say"—culminating in verses 43–48, which set God's all-embracing love over against Pharisaic exclusiveness. Hence the contrasts in chapter 6, between hypocritical alms, prayers, fastings, and the inner life of the spirit, that seeks first God's kingdom (verse 33) and trusts in him for all things needful. Hence, in chapter 7, the golden rule, and the final contrasts between the broad and narrow ways, the good and corrupt trees, the builders on the sand and on the rock. It is plain that the apparent harshness of these contrasts is only the beneficent surgery of the great physician, who

is trying to save the scribes and Pharisees themselves as well as their victims; for he is revealing the Father, who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. Three well-known little books by J. Oswald Dykes [2] give an excellent résumé of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, from the standpoint of the kingdom.

Matthew 8 and 9 record chiefly a group of miracles, but these make an opening for "the good news of the kingdom" (9:35), which is preached to all, with compassion for all. We in this missionary age have learned to interpret 9:37, 38 by that other word of Christ, "the field is the world." Matthew 10 gives Christ's instructions to his first messengers, as they began the work which we continue, the work of going into all the world, and preaching the gospel to every creature. Freely they had received it, freely they were

[2] The Beatitudes of the Kingdom. (New York, 1872.)
The Laws of the Kingdom. (New York, 1873.)
The Relations of the Kingdom to the World. (New York, 1874.)

to give it (verse 8), making proclamation like their Master: "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (verse 7).

A dozen bare statements of the universality of this gospel would not impress our hearts like the touching words in verse 29: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father." The exception made of the Samaritans (verse 5) was simply in order to save them; these prejudiced disciples would only have repelled them. Jesus himself won a whole city-full of them, and so did the apostles after Pentecost.

In chapter eleven, the scales fall from the eyes of John the Baptist, and the blessed "whosoever" sent to him (verse 5) chimes well with the invitation to *all* that labor and are heavy laden, which closes the chapter. All Christian history proves that they who heed Christ's "Come unto me" come to each other thereby.

Chapter twelve begins by translating into practical life the contrasts of the Sermon on the Mount, and ends with another gracious

"whosoever," which gives one of the clearest expressions of the universality of the kingdom: "whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother."

Chapter thirteen brings us back to the seven parables, of which we took that of the leaven as a sample. That the eye of Christ swept over all classes and conditions of all men in all time is manifest when we reflect that the truths of geometry are no more general in their application than the truths of this chapter. The people who are typified here are our neighbors; we meet them every day. The quiet assurance with which the Son of Man shows himself as revealer of the Father's work in all creation has in these parables but one out of many illustrations. For as Trench said so well:[3] "The world of nature is throughout a witness for the world of spirit, proceeding from the same hand, growing out of the same root, and being constituted for that very end; and the question suggested by the angel in

[3] Notes on the Parables, p. 13. (New York, 1872.)

Milton is often forced upon our meditations:—

> 'What if earth
> Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
> Each to other like, more than on earth is thought?' "

Chapter fifteen affords a signal instance of the universality of the gospel by the story of the woman of Canaan, whose faith "wrung a yea from Christ's seeming nay," and occasioned a notable lesson in the training of the twelve. In chapter sixteen, the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given to a humble fisherman, and by inference to every faithful confessor. We read just afterward, "*whosoever* shall lose his life for my sake shall find it," that is, shall find *eternal* life in the kingdom of God. The next group of sayings is in chapters eighteen and nineteen, which throw back light on Christ's answer to Peter's confession. The humble spirit, that of a child, is the key to the kingdom of heaven. Not all men can be great, but all can be lowly, and all are invited, with another *whosoever,* 18:4. The lost sheep meets us here again, and the Father

wills not that any should perish (18:14). The Lord of the kingdom of heaven is present in any two or three (verse 20) who meet anywhere on earth in the name of Jesus. The lesson of universal forgiveness which we found in the Lord's Prayer is expanded into a parable (verses 21–35). In 19:14 Jesus calls to himself *all* little children; "for to such belongeth the kingdom of heaven" (Am. R.V.). Such a childlike spirit comes hard to the rich (19:23), but they are not excluded, for with God all things are possible (verse 26).

In chapter twenty, every man in the marketplace is hired, and the welcome is as hearty to the Gentile, who comes late, as to the Jew, who comes early. The same grace to the despised and rejected appears more emphatically in chapter 21:31, 43. So in 22:10 the invitation to the feast, which is the kingdom of heaven (verse 2), gathers all in the highways, both bad and good. Chapter 23, verse 8, is the gospel in a nut-shell: "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." Christ has to clear away obstacles

in order to build; therefore the scribes and Pharisees are terribly denounced in this 23d chapter, not as men but as obstructers (verse 14): they shut up the kingdom of heaven against men. This attitude of theirs however is not to continue forever; the heart of Jesus yearns over them (verse 37) and he foretells their conversion (verse 39). Bunyan drew the right inference in "The Jerusalem sinner saved."

Chapter twenty-four looks on to the final stage of the kingdom of heaven; it contrasts the rise and fall of nations (verse 7) with the good news of the kingdom, which is for the whole world (verse 14). Compare 26: 13: "wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world." Chapter twenty-five gathers all the nations before the Son of Man (verse 32) and shows how to unite them all in him (verse 40). The condemnation that follows may be not so much an infallible prediction of a hopeless future, as a timely warning, in well-known apocalyptic pictures, against neglect of the only name

under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

The great teachings recorded in Matthew end with the commission (28: 18–20) from the Son of God, who has all authority in heaven and on earth, and who bids his followers go and make disciples everywhere, relying on his presence over all space and through all time. In that promise is the firm base and the sure hope of a Christian unity that is to embrace the whole world and transform the ruins of the fall into the city of the living God.

The brief gospel by Mark consists of action rather than teaching; nearly all the teaching occurs also in Matthew; an exception is the beautiful little parable of the seed growing secretly (4: 26–29). Its lesson is plain and is constantly verified throughout the ages:— though it be a Paul that plants, or an Apollos that waters, it is God alone that gives the increase; therefore let us rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him, and fret not ourselves because of evil-doers. "So is the kingdom of God."

The gospel by Luke is the gospel of humanity. Its catholic tone lies upon the surface, and is brought into clear light by all expositors. The parables of grace in chapter fifteen, of the vine-dresser in chapter thirteen, of the good Samaritan in chapter ten, we have already examined; but the other parables also have the same wide scope, which is sometimes expressed plainly, as in 18: 14; 14: 11: "every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

A book by James Stirling, already referred to, makes it evident that each one of the parables belongs to the teaching of our Lord concerning God's kingdom.[4]

It is often asserted that the gospel by John has almost nothing to say about the kingdom of heaven; but if this particular phrase is lacking, the idea certainly is not. We must not tie down the meaning of a great thought to a single form of expression. Besides the fundamental word to Nicodemus: Except a man

[4] Christ's Vision of the Kingdom of Heaven. (London, 1913.)

(i. e., any man) be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God, we have the term "all men," as in 1:7—"that all men through him might believe," which is exactly what we have found to be the goal of the kingdom of heaven.

Another expression, and a characteristic one, is "the world," for with John the message of salvation is as broad as the human race. God so loved the world (3:16) that he gave his only begotten Son; (3:17) "that the world should be saved through him." So in 4:41 —"this is indeed the Saviour of the world;" and in 6:33—"the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world."

A similar thought, with a varied expression, meets us in 7:17. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching"; that is a platform broad enough for all the world to stand on and find themselves in Christian unity. Chapter 8, verse 36, presents the same truth from still another angle: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Note also that

tender phrase in 10: 16, "other sheep I have," etc., which reveals the purpose of Christ, the path he means to tread, so long as one sheep is straying from the fold.

And now we reach the point from which we started; the great central teaching of chapters thirteen to seventeen. The Holy Spirit is to take up and carry on the work of Christ, convicting "the world" (16: 8). The mutual love enjoined by the new commandment is to be a badge of discipleship that "all men" will recognize (13: 35).

The more this law of love is studied, the more evident it becomes that God, who *is* love, has made all men in his image (however sin has obscured it), and that love is the great magnet which alone can draw men back to God and to one another, resolving most refractory substances, melting stony hearts. All true religion is founded on love; all forms of duty are summed up in love, which is the fulfilling of the law. Mark Hopkins's text-book of ethics [5] has been tested for several decades

[5] The Law of Love and Love as a Law. New York, 1869.

by thousands of college men and a great multitude of other thoughtful people. Few who know it would be disposed to deny that it sets forth the mind of Christ.

We may summarize the main teachings of Jesus in a few sentences. Every man, as the child of our Father, is salvable. The Son of God, who is the perfect expression of the Father's will, is seeking to save every man. The Holy Spirit's working in the followers of Jesus Christ is exactly what is meant by the kingdom of God, and also by Christian unity; these two agree in one. This unity is the present possession of all Christians, and the potential possession of all men. Organizations of Christians, whether local, national, or world-wide, we have not found alluded to in the main teachings of Jesus; they neither add to nor subtract from Christian unity, which is a fruit of the Spirit alone. How many and what organizations Christians will naturally develop is a question of practise, not of doctrine.

Christian unity is a thing of degrees, vary-

ing from what chemists call a trace up to the fullness of godly concord. It prevails more at any time and in any place, or it prevails less, just in proportion as Christians are with more or less singleness of heart working together with God. Whether each individual soul that ever lived on earth will finally work together with God, is a speculative question, outside the main teaching of Jesus. But the cheering truth belongs to this teaching, that on the great whole, Christian unity is to prevail increasingly until the will of God is done in earth as it is in heaven.

Here ends the first part of our discussion, which simply expands the first sentence of the Introduction. The second part of the road we are to travel is longer and much more difficult; but it simply expands the second sentence of the Introduction.

PART II

OUR CONSEQUENT DUTIES

CHAPTER I

THE TRUE POINT OF VIEW

If some reader, who is curious only about practical results, ignores the first part of this book, and glances through the following chapters, he will be properly disappointed; whatever force they possess rests on the foundation already laid. That foundation is either true or untrue, rock or sand; if the latter, the whole structure goes by the board, as it should. In this respect, a lecturer has the advantage of an author; the audience cannot look ahead, so as to pick and choose among his teachings. But on the other hand, this advantage belongs to an author, that he is secure from interruptions. If the first part of this book had been read in a social gathering, accustomed to a free give and take, it would have been greeted with many expressions of astonishment, impatience, or scornful contempt.

"Do you not know that you are building castles in the air? What we want is something practical. You might as well tell people 'be good and you will be happy' as 'love everybody.' "

"Do you not know that you are hopelessly behind the times? Have you not so much as heard of the current movements for federation and organic unity among the churches?"

"Are you aware that there is such a science as biblical criticism? No one would guess it from your citations."

"Do you not know that leading biblical scholars put the emphasis of Christ's teaching on the apocalyptic side, which you have neglected?"

"That which you call central is drawn from the fourth gospel, which recent authorities reject as over against the Synoptists?"

"That the Christian religion is only one out of many ethnic faiths that are treated of in the science of Comparative Religion?"

"That the claims of Christianity to universal acceptance are flatly contradicted by the great war among Christian nations?"

"That your assumed goal, the unity of the race, depends on the progress of humanity as a whole, not on the exegesis of texts?"

To all which it would be pertinent (and perhaps impertinent?), to answer with Elisha: "Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace." The objections are plausible, and the questions they raise are fair ones which will receive attention as we proceed. But the direction in which we are to proceed may as well be indicated frankly at the outset. The point of view occupied by some advocates of church unity fixes our gaze upon certain breaches and rents

in the ecclesiastical body. Eloquent things are said about these lamentable gaps and bleeding wounds, inflicted by the sin of schism. Naturally, with such a diagnosis, the remedy prescribed by those surgeons consists of plasters; when the wounds are drawn together, the bleeding will cease, and with careful nursing the patient will recover. There are other advocates of unity who see the superficial nature of this reasoning. If *A* is conscientiously opposed to *B,* in doctrine or practise, he will tolerate him none the more when *A's* church and *B's* church are externally clamped together. Make the basis of union whatsoever you please, and try it, during the next decade, on the churches of Irish Orangemen and Irish Romanists! We need not cross the Atlantic, either, to find as invincible race prejudices and class prejudices, in the face of which a declaration of church unity would be the hollowest mockery. Hence this second class of physicians would prescribe an internal remedy, a dose of ecclesiastical self-denial. "Let us emphasize," they

say, "the things wherein we agree; they are far more important than our differences. Let us summon a world conference of all kinds of churches, and in friendly companionship, each ready to surrender unessential points, let us work out a basis of reunion, acceptable to all."

As to this project, there is a danger not to be overlooked. Since the gathering must be a representative one, and not so large as to forbid deliberation, the same thing is likely to happen that has happened so often both in political and in religious conventions. Measures are adopted, in the enthusiasm of an assembly, that are received but coldly by the rank and file of the bodies represented. A recent instance in point was the attempt to unite three denominations of American Christians, at Nashville, in 1906. The union had been discussed for years, and it was thought next to impossible to agree on a doctrinal basis, but when such a basis was presented, it was instantly and *unanimously* adopted by the delegates. Every one said and

believed: "This is the Lord's doing and it is marvelous in our eyes." Yet all that painstaking work was repudiated, and those bodies have never come together to this day.

There are other physicians who differ from those just mentioned as radically as allopath from homeopath. They too would summon a world conference to unite all the churches, but on another basis. "If you are going to reduce these churches to their lowest terms," they say, "in order to find a common denominator, you will emasculate all that is characteristic and significant in each. Every one of them has contributed something to Christendom, and has something valuable to contribute to the Church Catholic. We all should recognize each as belonging to the body of Christ. Let our watchword be addition, not subtraction; a rich comprehensiveness, not a pale decoction." See, for instance, a pamphlet just issued: "The Object and Method of the World Conference" (Gardiner, Me., 1915). Such a gathering seems to be a step in the right direction, though not the most important

step to be taken, a step also which belongs to the future, and is by no means to be hastened. This last point is made prominent by the chief advocates of the conference. A vast deal of preliminary work is necessary, and is being attempted; no such ecumenical assembly should be looked for, they think, for years to come. And this plan, like the other, conceals a subtle danger. What if some of these rich additions shall prove to have come from without the fold of Christ, instead of from within? What if they are even contrary to his mind and will? With a great sum obtained we our deliverance from ecclesiastical tyranny. "For freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." While it is false humility for the foot to say "Because I am not the hand I am not of the body," it is insolent arrogance for any member to say to any other, "I am thy head." This matter will be examined more fully in the chapter entitled, "The Catholic Church."

I believe there is a fundamental error in all

these remedies. They lay the chief stress upon visible union between existing bodies, whereas the thing to emphasize is an invisible thing, not union but unity. Bishop Rhinelander of Philadelphia has put this so well (in the *Holy Cross Magazine,* April, 1911), that I cannot do better than to quote some sentences from his presentation of the subject.

"Union for the strength that is in it; unity for the life it gives; these are two very common and perfectly familiar 'social motives.' And they are different motives. Friendship is a different thing from partnership. Friends are naturally partners and often partners are friends. But still the two words stand for two distinct relationships. Friendship means sharing all chief things in life for the sole joy of sharing. The sharing of life and its possessions is not a side issue, but the very heart of friendship. Unity is its end and aim. Unity really exhausts its meaning. Partnership, on the other hand, means not corporate life but common work. It means co-operation with other people for the sake of getting something done in a speedy, gainful, or effective way. Partnership exists because there is strength in union.

"In our religious life, we are seeking either for union or for unity, all our various or varying Christian social institutions being witness. Christians, on the one hand, combine for the strength that comes from union. There are services to be maintained; there are obligations to be met; there are good works to be done; there are programmes or creeds to be upheld. None of these things can be done adequately, unless an adequate number of people unite to do them. So 'congregations' or 'societies'

or 'churches' are formed, that these desirable results may be achieved by the strength that comes through union.

"On the other hand, Christians are drawn, or grow, together simply as Christians. Whether in the family, or in the congregation, or on the mission field, their religion means a corporate life rather than a co-operative work. Such Christians may in their turn 'co-operate in Missions' and spend all their united strength to 'evangelize the world,' but always, and in everything, it is fellowship, or unity, they seek; more fellowship and more unity because they are bound to be dissatisfied till all the race is one."

My own point of view, while in harmony with that just cited, would make it more definite in two particulars. First, Christian unity is a present fact, actual in all Christians, potential in all mankind. Whenever we speak of it as pertaining to the future, as an ideal, or a goal, or a task to be achieved, it is a larger, more comprehensive unity that is meant. But, as the apostle tells us: "he that hath the Son *hath* life"; and as our Lord tells us: "he hath passed out of death into life." Where there is life there is hope; and where there is any degree of the life of Christ among Christians, there is just the same degree of Christian unity. For things that are equal to the same

thing are equal to each other. Christian unity *is* the life of Christ, implanted by the Holy Spirit in his disciples (see page 57). This is the doctrine; and the duty thereon consequent is not difficult to deduce.

For secondly, I believe it to be a mistake to attempt to promote unity from the top instead of from the bottom. The natural order of progress seems to be indicated in the second great commandment of the gospel. Christian neighbors are to form a more perfect union, not by their church constitutions, but by the love of Christ constraining them to love one another as each loves himself. Then the leaven is to work in thousands of little communities, scattered over all the earth. Then the same spirit of love will cause these tiny clusters, here a few and there a few, to blend and coalesce. Local limits are passed, racial prejudices are melted down, national boundaries are overleaped, all barriers are burned away by the ardent flame of love, which burns on till the whole world is a fellowship of brothers in Christ the elder brother.

I am not describing the past growth of Christianity, except in its initial stages. We all know how soon this simple program of Jesus was frustrated by the pride of man, which counted a nation conquered for Christ when its kings and princes had received water baptism; which sacrificed brotherhood to the lust of power, and righteousness to creeds and ceremonies; which built up rival dominions, as uncouth as the image in Daniel's vision, and called them churches of Christ. And some of these same churches of Christ (God save the mark!) are identical with nations now in deadly strife; it is churches like these that some people suppose are to be invited to come together and vote themselves the body of Christ. What a sacrilege! There is no Christian unity, except the love of Christ in the hearts of his disciples. Love is light, and we are to let it shine in all the relations of life. If any one thinks this unpractical, he should study the alphabet of Christianity and learn how utterly unpractical is anything that leaves it out. It is precisely its practical ap-

plication which comes next in order. A man might climb a ladder, kicking out each round behind him as he goes up, and then call from the top to his neighbor: "come up hither," but he would call in vain. Many people have imbibed the notion that the teachings of Christ are as impossible to put in practise. When they hear any one of those trumpet calls to the spirit, like "Blessed are the pure in heart," or "Hallowed be thy name," they admit that here is a glorious ideal, and that *if* everybody would live up to it, this world would be a Paradise, but they ask how this can be effected? There are helps, I reply, right at our hand, in the common relations of everyday life. We proceed to investigate some of the unconventional means of grace.

CHAPTER II

THE HOME

THAT is where charity begins, and charity is love; he who bade us love our neighbors as ourselves surely expects us to bestow that grace upon our nearest neighbors, even them of our own household.

Some characters in fiction are as well known as most characters in history. One of them is Mrs. Jellyby, with her eyes fixed on Borrioboola Gha, and her house (not a home) beggaring description. How Dickens would have enjoyed girding at the right Reverends and the wrong Reverends, if he had caught some of them proposing a convention for unity in the church universal, while they were notorious for making their own homes unhappy. The case is supposable; and even the hypothesis is sufficient to confirm our contention that little duties precede great ones; that the flame

should burn, brightly and quietly, at our own hearth-stones, before we try to kindle a great blaze to be reflected in the front pages of the secular newspapers. It was Dickens, by the way, who gave to the boys of an American schoolship a motto quite germane to the whole subject before us: "Do all the good you can, and don't make any fuss about it."

What is to become of our Christian homes? A man lately died who did what one man could to stem the downward drift. I refer to Dr. Samuel W. Dike, founder of the New England Divorce Reform League, which soon took on a national scope. Thoughtful by nature, deeply read in all branches of the new science of Sociology, he early saw and felt the strategic position of the home for the solution of our leading social problems. He was fond of saying: "the question is not what we can do for the home, but what the home can do for us." He had distinct and clear-cut plans for using the ministry of the home in the salvation of the world. And yet the response to his efforts was discouragingly small; he was

as the voice of one crying in a great wilderness.

> "Truths would you teach, to save a sinking land?
> All shun, none aid you, and few understand."

Dr. Dike published no books, but he was a diligent sower of the seed out of which books are made. Those who are familiar with his lifework will recognize my indebtedness to it in some of the pages that follow.

Many who would assent to the familiar lines:

> "Home's not merely four square walls,
> Though with pictures hung and gilded,"

fail to perceive that home also exceeds the sum of the people who compose it. That sum would be the same if each of these individuals was confined to a separate room of the house; but home is society, and Christian unity is the unity of society. After centuries of too exclusive dealing with individuals, Christianity is returning to its primal proclamation: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." It is waking up to realize the duty and the glory of leavening all human society with the spirit of our

Lord. It lays hold eagerly of every power that it can utilize to further this comprehensive purpose; but as yet it has made scant use of that modest but mighty ally, the home. One needs only to look at the home—not an impossibly perfect one, but such as we may see all around us,—to perceive its divine adaptation to such an end. Probably most of the readers of this book had their birth and early training in a Christian home. If any such reader should attempt to untwist and separate from his life the contributions made to that life by his childhood's home, he would find it a difficult feat; they are not like the strands of a cable, but like the tissue of a living organ. The analogy might be followed in some detail. It is great Nature, or to speak more justly, it is our Father, that weaves the mysterious web of physical tissue which becomes the building and repairing force, the conservative and at the same time progressive element, in the whole structure of the human body. From this view-point, how thoroughly modern is the One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Psalm.

"Thou didst form my inward parts; thou didst knit me together in my mother's womb. My frame was not hidden from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth."

Now the home is the living tissue of society, the place where, by subtle and hidden processes its very fabric is originally woven. Home is the fountain of our life-powers during their whole activity, the salt that preserves and the tonic that restores them. Character is the normal, specific product of the home; and character is what all the world is sighing for. When your character began you cannot tell with any definiteness; but how and why it began is more easily said. You were enswathed in the atmosphere of a home, and you were breathing, as the breath of your daily life, its spiritual principles, habits, and ideals, long before you came to distinct moral consciousness.

In Bushnell's *Christian Nurture,* there is a striking chapter, expounding a striking text. The text is Jer. 7: 18—"The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead the dough, to make cakes to the

queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings to other gods, that they may provoke me to anger." The theme is the organic unity of the family, and the argument is that of Paul, when he would provoke his own people to jealousy by the example of the Gentiles. Everywhere, outside of Christianity, families go together, in their thoughts, words, feelings, and acts, as they have done from the foundation of the world. Christian families cannot escape this law, if they would; precepts that go counter to the family spirit and practise are words cast upon the winds. But they ought not to escape it if they could, for God is in it; his covenant is with these households unto a thousand generations. That covenant is being fulfilled in the everyday life of a Christian home.

When we set memory at work upon our childhood, we recall certain outlines; the experience of manhood fills them out; and so, though the processes of Christian nurture are out of sight, some of its results are clear. We need not try to add another to

the many definitions of religion; but our own "experience of religion"—not in the technical, but in the true sense—came first to us through the training of home. It was a mother, perhaps, who taught us to say "Our Father," and we began to feel dimly that the great God was like father and mother both. Dependence was an element in this feeling, trust was another. The correlative ideas of obligation and obedience dawned upon consciousness naturally from the repetition of home duties, and were purified and elevated into the sphere of worship. There was family government in the home; childhood's faults were dealt with faithfully but kindly; patience had her perfect work, and forgiveness followed close upon repentance. Thus great vistas were opened, giving new views of the loving-kindness of God. Hope, the star of childhood, led us into invincible optimism, and helped our parents to make the eternal home of the blessed a real thing to us. The Bible came to us first in solution, by the medium of pictures, and of stories that had been predigested for home consump-

tion. The services of the sanctuary were doubtless wearisome and largely unmeaning; small wonder if we complained and kicked against them; but long before we went to church, the home had trained us to submit to unwelcome discipline; and after all, the service was only family worship indefinitely extended. We can realize now, if we could not then, what inward springs of character we should have lost, if the holy time had been always spent in playing with other children.

Moreover, life is not summed up in worship, nor in what is commonly known as religion. In the true home, the unseemly divorce between sacred and secular is unknown. Both in the daily plays and in the daily tasks of the home, some of the finest fruits of character are being slowly matured. Children train one another, in wholesome and effective ways, to courage, activity, endurance, vigor, perseverance; to honesty, courtesy, truth, justice, fidelity; to self-restraint, self-respect, regard for others, affection, reverence. Meanwhile, they are not only watched, but encour-

aged and nurtured in faith, hope, and love, by a Christian father and mother. When the spirit of the home is the spirit of Christ, the whole family, as a social unit, is growing up in all things into him who is the head, even Christ. What is this but the supreme type of Christian unity, the kingdom of God in miniature and sample?

The pessimist interrupts us here with his accustomed wail. There are no such families, he says, in the present generation, and there will soon be no families at all. The world is given up to hotels and boarding-houses, where children are undesirable citizens. The automobile and the golf-links have destroyed the Sabbath. The feverish pressure of business leaves no time for home training; and as for home discipline, the new commandment is in full force: "parents, obey your children." The divorce courts break up a yearly increasing multitude of homes; the enhanced cost of living and the growing fascination of worldly pleasures make young married people more and more reluctant to bring children into the

world. At one pole of society is the rich man's palace, at the other the poor man's dive; neither is a home.

Truly, this indictment gives us matter for serious reflection and stimulus to needed reform. But why should our friend the pessimist hold his little corner of experience so close to his eyes that it shuts out the great world? Our country looks small on the map of the globe; but by the census of 1910 there are 20,255,555 families in the United States. Let us grant that there is not a single absolutely flawless home among them; but let it be granted on the other side that five in a hundred, at the lowest calculation, are genuine Christian homes. Who can estimate the leavening power of a million Christian homes in America?

While I write this chapter, a letter comes in from a young layman in Beirut, Syria, in answer to one I had sent on the occasion of the death of his mother, who was my friend. "She was a great blessing to her children," he writes. "How often I have thought of my

rich heritage in my parents; they did not leave much money or property, but the blessed memory of God-fearing lives and the seeds of righteous living planted in their children. There is a fresh incentive for us to honor her by continuing the noble work she tried to do."

The other children of that mother are witnessing for Christ in America, in China, and in Turkey. Could the history of that one family be written, it would open up to view a thousand streams from the river of life that have made glad the city of our God. But the history of such a family is never written, save in the book of life; the Lord knoweth them that are his; their life is hid with Christ in God.

The pessimist has called renewed attention to certain evils with which we are grappling and must long grapple, but on the main question he simply has no case. There is force, however, in the complaint voiced by some of the most thoughtful Christians of our time, that the family is being subjected to severe pressure from various directions. Now that

nearly all lines of industry are open to women, a strong temptation is felt in many households of the poor, to add to the family income by utilizing the outside toil of the wife and mother. Sometimes this pressure comes from the husband, sometimes from the wife herself. The question: "What is to become of the home meanwhile?" is dismissed as too abstract, or, if put concretely, "What will become of the children?" it is solved through the good offices of neighbors or neighborly societies and social settlements. Too often, in the face of stringent laws, the labor of the children themselves is extorted. The evil in another shape assails families somewhat higher in the scale. Not only are the professions and various forms of clerical service open to women, and eagerly sought to secure independence, but economic considerations lead an increasing number of men to look dubiously upon marriage, and either to defer it as long as possible, or to stay content in bachelorhood.

There is a further obstacle to which we cannot shut our eyes. It is that the present tactics

of the churches tend to neglect or to push aside into an inferior place, the perennnial ministry of the home. We have been dominated for more than half a century by a continued insistence on public meetings, and on miscellaneous societies, banded together for every good purpose under the sun, but calling people away from the home, and leaving to the latter but slight time and force for its proper work. The late Dr. Daniel Merriman[1] puts this none too strongly.

"Curiously enough, the church is yielding itself to this craze for organization, and in yielding, is itself a chief sinner against its own birthright and mission; for instead of fostering to the utmost the family and home, in whose strength, purity, and beauty its own strength is bound up, it is creating in and around itself a multitude of organizations which distract attention from family life and the home. We need to take care that we do not pull down God's work and put contempt upon his methods with one hand, while we are perhaps intent on doing his work by magnifying our own contrivance with the other."

The situation calls for a form of self-denial that is quite peculiar. Benevolently inclined persons ought to refuse firmly the temptation

[1] In a paper read at Minneapolis, October, 1892.

to perform a whole round of good works which can be carried on better in the family circle, and they ought to use persistent urgency to stir up the homes of the people to return to their legitimate functions. Dr. Dike has condensed the philosophy of this matter into a single pungent sentence: [2]

"It is a sociological crime to let alone a torpid social institution because you can more easily do its work elsewhere than awaken its sluggish forces."

The question comes back upon us, then,—"What is the special ministry of the home, as one great department of the kingdom of God?" The answer is that its chief work is to show forth the love of God and the love of man, in the natural relations of wedded life, and in the nurture of children from their birth up. Every child is robbed of its birthright if it never has the experience of a loving home. Jacob Riis, in his excellent book *"The Peril and the Preservation of the Home"* [3] mentions an interesting series of experiments be-

[2] Report on the Family, p. 18. Boston, 1907.
[3] The William S. Bull lectures, pp. 22, 23. Philadelphia, 1903.

gun in New York in 1899. I take pleasure in quoting his vivid language.

"It was an old scandal in our city that practically all the babies in the Foundling Hospital died there. I say scandal, not in the sense that any one was to blame. They tried hard enough. Men are not monsters, to see a defenceless baby die without trying to help it. In the worst Tammany days, we had herds of Jersey cows on Randall's Island kept expressly for those waifs. Everything was done that pity and experience could suggest, but nothing availed. The babies died, and there was no help for it, until four years ago, when a joint Committee of the State Charities Aid Association and the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, took them off the hands of the city authorities and put them in homes. The first year after that, the mortality among them fell to a little over fifty percent, the second year it was just beyond thirty percent, and the fourth, which was last year, it had fallen to *ten and seven tenths* percent, a figure quite below the mortality among all the children two years of age in the whole city. And the experience in Brooklyn was just the same. What did it mean? It meant this, and nothing less, that these children had come at last to their rights; that every baby is entitled to one pair of mother's arms around its neck; that its God-given right is a *home.*"

Incidentally, this narrative shows us two things; first, that there are a great many homes so thoroughly Christian that they are willing to take in and nurture even the waifs of society; what multitudes more there must be that are trying to give Christian training to

their own flesh and blood! Again, we perceive here one of several indications that the pendulum has begun to swing back from the crowded city to the open country. The last two decades have furnished many solid motives, well fitted to arrest the rush to the great centres of population, and to restore to the country its proper share in the world's life. This tendency works directly in the interest of pure and orderly homes.

It is the business of the Christian church, and of all who love our Lord, to promote in every way the planting and reclaiming of the largest number and the highest quality of Christian families. It is the business of these families, in their turn, to send out into the varied energies of the kingdom of God a constant stream of well-trained youth, ardently loyal to the King, and faithfully co-operating with each division of his army to bear the banner of the cross to victory. To secure a nominal Christian unity with the home left out would be a calamity; the work would have to be done all over again. But the beneficent

activity of the home carries with it the heavenly harmony of all God's people everywhere; and so we regard the home as lying at the very foundation of all the divinely appointed means of grace.

CHAPTER III

THE SCHOOL

AT this point, it may be well to give heed to the reader who has been waiting patiently to file an objection.

"You have been mounting a hobby," he complains, "and riding, as fast as possible, away from your subject. An essay on The Home, with the phrase 'Christian Unity' lugged in here and there, is a very different matter from the task demanded by the theme; namely, a discussion of the question how the whole people of God, scattered throughout all lands, and torn by internal dissensions, can regain the unity of the apostolic age. And now you evidently intend to put forth a few lucubrations on the school, the shop, and what not." I respectfully plead guilty to that intention, and not guilty to the main charge; asking the courteous objector to note the state-

ment in the Preface, that the method of this book is inductive, not logical; and also the claim in the Introduction, that society, business, politics, etc., are embraced in the kingdom of God; and also the phrase at the close of Part II, Chapter I, "unconventional means of grace." Later, we shall have a few chapters on conventional means. What the objector seems to desiderate is a great ecclesiastical movement, visible to all men, and heralded by a cosmopolitan press; what the present writer earnestly seeks to aid is an inward, spiritual movement, known of God rather than men, reaching down to the roots of everyday life, as unobtrusive as the air we breathe, and as useful. When we were studying the theory of the subject, in Part I, it was observed that almost any of the precepts of Christ which we examined were sufficient, if universally followed, to secure Christian unity; here in Part II, the practical question is constantly before us; what will induce men to obey those precepts of our Lord? The first answer has been already given: conserve and multiply Chris-

tian homes. The practical difficulty is urged: "but multitudes of children never know such homes"; and the practical answer is now ready in a second means of grace, Christian schools. These cannot take the place of homes, it is true, but they can do immense good. Even when children have had ideal home training, they ought to meet those who lack it, in the great arena of the common school, the child's mirror of the world of men.[1] I know that much can be said in favor of an exclusive home training, which would shelter the loved children from contact with the rough-and-tumble of the outside world, and especially from contact with its wickedness. I know too the moral flabbiness that often results from such an exclusive policy. Jesus Christ was a great democrat. Christian parents ought to pray his prayer after him: "I pray not that

[1] Compare Comenius, The Great Didactic (Keatinge's edition), p. 216. "When a tree cultivator, in his walks through woods and thickets, finds a sapling suitable for transplanting, he does not plant it in the same place where he finds it, but digs it out and places it in an orchard, where he cares for it in company with a hundred others. And therefore, as orchards are laid out for fruit-trees, so also should schools be erected for the young."

thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil."

Let us look in on one of our public schools in session. There is no family unity here, nor even race unity. The Italian jostles the Pole; the Slovak mingles with the Swede; the boy of pure Saxon blood sits beside a negro boy, (for this scene is not laid in the sunny South). Over the school-house waves the American flag, and under that flag the experiment is being tried of moulding and training these restless children of restless races into good American citizens. I should say, the experiment is being repeated for the ten thousandth time. We are always confident of its success; for we know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. Note yonder Russian Jewish maiden, whose dark eyes are fixed on the teacher as intently as if she would devour her very spirit. She is to be another Mary Antin; she will prove that this school is no failure, whatever the future has in store for the two or three score of other pupils. If we could visit this same class a few years farther

on in their course, we should be struck by their harmony rather than their diversity. Americanization has become triumphant; the foreign born hold their heads just a little higher than the native born, but all are singing together with a will:

"My country, 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty."

What of the children of the poor, and especially those that had no home advantages? The common school is their paradise; if parents desire to keep any of them at home now and then, they beg and plead to go to their teacher.

What of the children of the rich, and especially those that had no home discipline? Their parents have daily cause to bless the school drill, that keeps the children in subjection to rightful authority. Without it, they would almost certainly make a wreck of life; with it, they are growing not only into habits of order and application, but also into a hearty, democratic comradeship with all their schoolmates, in an atmosphere that applauds

whatever is manly, and laughs down all aristocratic pretension. Hear them sing again:

> "Then let us pray that come it may,
> As come it will for a' that,
> That sense and worth, o'er a' the earth,
> May bear the gree, and a' that.
> For a' that, and a' that,
> It's coming yet, for a' that,
> That man to man, the warld o'er
> Shall brothers be for a' that."

I think too little is usually made of the disciplinary value of school athletics. Often, ambitious boys enter the field, with eager passions that have never brooked submission to any kind or degree of authority. The only child of rich parents, for instance, may hitherto have been monarch of all he surveyed, and his right there was none to dispute. At his own sweet will he has let his angry passions rise;—but as soon as he appears on the playground, he finds himself no longer a king but only a pawn. His value is precisely that of his digital unit, which no ciphers can multiply; he has to play the game for all he is worth. The first act of insubordination, whether by open rebellion, or by mere neglect

of the proper team-play, is instantly met by proper discipline; and after a few such lessons, the boy learns his place and co-operates heartily with the rest. The habit of implicit obedience will stay by him through life—which is a magnified play-ground—and will stand him in good stead.

It must not be supposed that the unity that results from education is obtained by the suppression of individuality, by the knocking off of the precious crystalline structure that marks the peculiar development of this or that original mind. What really takes place is precisely the contrary, as the very word education testifies. To bring these rare qualities into the light, and under the mastery of their nominal possessor, this is the teacher's calling, and none is more glorious. It is not uniformity that results from the process of education, but the harmony of many instruments of diverse quality and pitch. The two conceptions are no more alike than a symphony in Albert Hall is like the clang of the London streets, or its analogue that Arthur Hallam found so irksome:

> "But if I praised the busy town,
> He loved to rail against it still,
> For 'ground in yonder social mill
> We rub each other's angles down,
> And merge,' he said, 'in form and gloss
> The picturesque of man and man.'"

If the critic persists that, after all, the school *is* a mill that takes the raw material of childhood and polishes it into smoothness, I admit that there are schools—and schools. In my limited observation as a teacher, and again as a superintendent of schools, I have sometimes seen this repulsive grind, which substitutes inducation for education. But in the first place, there is a true as well as a false grinding, and its very object and result is to bring out individuality; witness the diamond, which none but the expert would recognize, but for the polishing of its brilliant faces. And in the next place, when we examined the Cardinal Precept (Part I, Chapter I), we found that Christian unity is not an attainment but a goal. The perfect school is as rare as the perfect home; but in each case we search for the true ideal, and then try to make it potent in actual life, assured that it will prove itself an engine

of mighty power in the great business of making the kingdom of God triumphant in human affairs. What would Christian unity be with education left out? An ignorant enthusiasm, that would soon spend itself. To build that stately temple for eternity, we must delve patiently, year after year, at its vast foundations that are out of sight. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the teacher's work is unrecorded and unnoticed, while the warrior's praises are sung by poets and orators; but when we come to ask their relative value to human society, we are ashamed to speak of them in the same breath. One destroys and the other builds; one exterminates, the other perpetuates. One is hostile to the kingdom of God; the other is its trusty ally.

This last statement will not pass without question. Is it true, after all, that education is Christian, or even religious? Are we not careful, especially in America, to keep it colorless, to guard its religious neutrality? It is true that our laws and customs have sought to establish this impracticable neutral ground;

the attempt has led to perpetual turmoil, but the best educators are beginning to see daylight through the darkness, now that the true nature of education is better understood. On the specific point which occasioned much of the controversy, that of requiring that a few verses of the Bible should be read at each school session, the agitation has been utterly needless; the issue ought never to have been raised. Some teachers whom I have known have met this requirement with a legal compliance, coupled with an irreverence of manner most injurious to the religious impression that was sought by the statute. "What you are," says Emerson, "speaks so loud that I cannot hear what you say." [2]

On the larger subject of the relation of the state to religious education in America, there exists a wide but not a hopeless divergence of opinion. The plan which is perhaps most characteristically American consists in a divi-

[2] Compare George A. Coe in the Cyclopedia of Education, Vol. V, p. 147. (New York, 1913.) "It is a matter of common knowledge that German classes in 'religion' are often formal, perfunctory, and anything but religious, because the teacher lacks religious motive."

sion of labor that commits religion to the home and the church, education to the state. At the opposite extreme is the contention of the Roman Catholics that this theory of education is like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet's part left out. Religion, they hold, is the most important part of education, and religion cannot be taught by the state, only by the church. If the state taxes all citizens to support its godless schools, it ought to subsidize the church schools. Between these extremes is a thoughtful and probably growing multitude, who believe that by following either of these policies something would be lost which it is highly important to retain. For on the first plan, there is a vast number of children whom the home and the church never reach with religious training; the home, because it has neither the time nor the ability; the church, because it cannot compel attendance on its meetings. To let these children grow up without such instruction is a cruel deprivation, not only to them but to the state, in which this untrained element becomes a continual menace. And

on the other plan, both the state and the child suffer from an unwholesome cleavage of the population on the line of religious convictions or even prejudices, which unavoidably become accentuated to the detriment of all concerned; for when the children of any community are educated away from each other, there is little likelihood that the community itself will become united and strong. So a third plan proposed is to set apart certain school hours each week, when the school authorities, in co-operation with the parents, shall secure the religious instruction of Jewish children by their Rabbis, of Catholics and Russians (Holy Orthodox) by their priests, of Protestants by their pastors, of others by ethical instructors, etc. Whether different schoolrooms should be used, or the children should be sent to their churches, synagogues, etc., is an unessential detail; in the former case, the present habit of many children to look slightingly on religious, as compared with secular, education, would be corrected; in the latter case, the sacred associations of the sanctuary would

have their appropriate weight. But in either case, (and this is no unessential detail), the whole educational endeavor would develop a true organism, in which (according to Kant's felicitous definition), each part is at the same time the means and the end of all the rest.

I confess, I expect far less benefit from the few hours devoted to religious instruction than from the constant and unconscious absorption by the child of the teacher's own personality. The true remedy for godless schools is to put out of their teaching force any man who would read the Bible flippantly, any woman whose heart is in fashion and folly. Such an exclusion follows naturally and inevitably when we have found the right answer to the question from which we have been digressing. "Is education religious or not?" They who have the right to answer that question with authority are the recognized masters in the field of education, from Comenius in the seventeenth century, through Pestalozzi in the eighteenth, and Froebel in the nineteenth, to Montessori in the twentieth.

Let us examine a few significant extracts from these writers.

Comenius, *The Great Didactic,* page 218.[3]

"The following reasons will establish that not the children of the rich or of the powerful only, but of all alike, boys and girls, both noble and ignoble, rich and poor, in all cities and towns, villages and hamlets, should be sent to school.

"In the first place, all who have been born to man's estate have been born with the same end in view, namely, that they may be men, that is to say, rational creatures, the lords of other creatures, and the images of their Creator. All, therefore, must be brought on to a point at which, being properly imbued with wisdom, virtue, and piety, they may usefully employ the present life and be worthily prepared for that to come. God himself has frequently asserted that with him there is no respect of persons, so that if, while we admit some to the culture of the intellect, we exclude others, we commit an injury not only against those who share the same nature as ourselves, but against God himself, who wishes to be acknowledged, to be loved, and to be praised, by all upon whom he has impressed his image."

Pestalozzi, *Swan Song,* § 139, page 274.[4]

"As the method of the development of the faculties by *elementary education* is based on love and faith, it must necessarily lead to Christian thought, sentiment and action. Of course religion of itself does not turn out a merchant, a tradesman, a scholar, or an artist. But it grounds, develops, and fortifies the frame of mind which

[3] Keatinge's edition. (London, 1896.)

[4] Quoted from Pinloche's Pestalozzi. (London, 1902.) "Elementary Education" is what he calls his system. The italics are his.

elevates, sanctifies, purifies, and makes truly human in its inward nature the calling of the merchant, the tradesman, and every other calling. . . . All means of quickening the power common to all men which do not start from the spirit and the life of our inner divine being, but from the sensual impulses of the flesh and blood of our animal selfishness, are not *elementary*. It is the complete harmony of *elementary education* with Christianity which also distinguishes it from the spirit of the age."

Froebel, *Education of Man,* § 62, page 94.[5]

"Nature, as well as all that exists, is the declaration and revelation of God. Everything that exists has its foundation in the revealing of God. Everything that exists has its foundation and existence only through the life abiding in God. . . . It is possible for the Christian only, for the man with Christian thought, life, and effort, to come to a true conception and vivid recognition of Nature; only such a man can be a genuine naturalist. It is possible for man to approach to a true knowledge of Nature only when he is consciously or unconsciously, dimly or clearly, a Christian; that is, when he is penetrated with the truth of the one living power of God working in all things; when he is filled with the one living spirit of God, which is in all things, and to which he is himself subjected, through which all Nature has its being and existence, and through which he is in a condition to perceive this one spirit in its being and its unity, in the smallest phenomenon, and in the sum of all the phenomena of Nature."

Montessori, *The Montessori Method,* page 13.[6]

"Let us try to enter into the minds and hearts of those first followers of Jesus as they heard him speak of a king-

[5] Jarvis's edition. (New York, 1886.)
[6] (New York, 1912.)

dom not of this world, greater far than any earthly kingdom, no matter how royally conceived. In their simplicity they asked of him, 'Master, tell us who shall be greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' To which Christ, caressing the head of a little child, who, with reverent wondering eyes, looked into his face, replied, 'Whosoever shall become as one of these little ones, he shall be greatest in the kingdom of heaven.' Now let us picture, among those to whom these words were spoken, an ardent, worshipping soul, who takes them into his heart. With a mixture of respect and love, of sacred curiosity and of a desire to achieve this spiritual greatness, he sets himself to observe every manifestation of this little child. Even such an observer, placed in a classroom filled with little children, will not be the new educator whom we wish to form. But let us seek to implant in the soul the self-sacrificing soul of the scientist with the reverent love of the disciple of Christ, and we shall have prepared the spirit of the teacher. From that child itself he will learn how to perfect himself as an educator."

Strange to say, both Froebel and Pestalozzi have been ignorantly supposed to have been hostile to Christianity. Whenever we find as we sometimes do, a teacher who holds that education and religion should be kept in separate compartments, it would be well to send him to school to the great masters of his art.

CHAPTER IV

THE CALLING

AFTER the home, the school; after the school the work. The normal man, however, does not leave the home; he founds a family of his own; and though he may leave the school, his education is continued and never completed. Thus the kingdom of God grows like a tree, ever assimilating new material.

The terms work, labor, industry, business, profession, are scarcely comprehensive enough to cover the department of human life which we are to consider next. If not in themselves, yet in their implications and associations, they have a divisive tendency, as seen in the phrases "working classes," "labor problems," "industrial occupations," "business competition," "professional jealousy." Besides, they emphasize the active side of the subject; but if we

seek the whole truth, we shall find that a man is acted on before he acts; he is called into the vineyard before he labors in the vineyard. The good old Saxon word "calling"—a much better word than its fashionable equivalent, "vocation"—forbids leaving God out of the bargain, whatever our business is.

I may digress long enough to make it clear that this book is written for men who believe in God, as most men do. Most men who think they do not are merely in revolt against an inhuman being up in the sky, who is still sometimes preached as the God of the Bible, but who is really as dead as the gods of Greece and Rome. I ask renewed attention to the statement at the beginning of Part II, that this whole discussion falls to the ground unless Part I is accepted; in other words, unless we receive Christ's revelation of the God and Father of us all, whose nature and whose name is love. With one who really denies this God, it is commonly of little use to reason; what he needs is to come close to a real Christian. I was greatly impressed when a

boy by a true story [1] of a young Irish lawyer, who would declaim by the hour against Christianity, on the ground that England, the oppressor of his country, was a Christian nation, but who finally said to the Christian who had been trying to win him: "You spoke of examples of religion in private life. Let me tell you, the example of my old aunt has been a *demonstration* to me. Satan cannot shake it." I could give more than one such instance from my own pastoral experience, and the leaders of the "Men and Religion Forward Movement" could supply them by the score. There is no good reason why reasonable men should shut their eyes to such facts.

But to return from this digression: each of us ought to regard his own calling, and everybody's calling, as an unconventional means of grace. This completely reverses what politicians call the labor problem; instead of asking "what can we do for labor?" the question becomes: How can the calling of the laborer, or that of the employer, or that of any

[1] The first in the series called "A Pastor's Sketches," by I. S. Spencer. (New York, 1851, p. 58.)

one else, advance the kingdom of God? Practically, to be sure, we shall come out at the same point as all honest men reach, so far as every form of injustice and tyranny is concerned; the glorious King whom we serve will use us as a rod wherewith to smite the oppressor, whether it be an oppressive church member that evicts his poor tenants or an oppressive labor-union that mobs a faithful workman.

Let us try to get a fair view of the whole situation, remembering that here, as everywhere, the field is the world. A quotation from one of the greatest poems ever written will make a good starting-point.

> "If I have despised the cause
> Of my man-servant or my maid-servant,
> When they contended with me;
> What then shall I do when God riseth up?
> And when he visiteth, what shall I answer him?
> Did not he that made me in the womb make him?
> And did not one fashion us in the womb?" [2]

No one knows the age of this poem, but at any rate, it is thousands of years older than

[2] Job 31:13–15.

we are, while yet it is so fresh and modern as to come upon us with startling force. The passage cited gives all the main elements of our own social and industrial problems; justice and injustice, service and responsibility, humanity and brotherhood. Here too are the very characters of our everyday drama, the laborer, the employer, and the third party, so often left out of the reckoning, God. The reader should not brush aside the analogy, with the impatient thought that there is a wide difference between that ancient civilization and our own; between the simple, pastoral experiences of an Eastern sheikh, and the complex questions of today. For the author of this wonderful book was by no means ignorant of civic and industrial problems on a great scale. He knew the cities of Egypt and the mines of Arabia. *From out of the populous city men groan,* he cries (24: 12, R. V.), and the cry would make a good motto for a trade-union journal. The context is a vivid picture of cruel power reducing the poor to their lowest terms. See Strahan on the passage, as cited

below.[3] And the author had felt the contrast between this thronging life and the utter desolation of the miner (28:4).

"He sinketh a shaft far from the habitations of men, he is forgotten of those who walk above, he swingeth suspended afar from men."

I quote from the version of Samuel Cox (London, 1880), who adds:

"these mines, with their shafts, working apparatus and smelting-places, are to be seen to this day in the very condition in which they were left by the Egyptian workmen four or five thousand years ago; the very marks of their tools being so fresh and sharp in that pure dry atmosphere, that more than one traveller has felt, while looking at them, as though the miners had but knocked off work for a spell, and might come back to it at any moment."

I have purposely given these details, in order to show that human nature is the same in all ages, and especially in order to lift us out of our own surroundings, that we may give diligent heed to the great teaching of that book. Job was a capitalist, an employer of labor. When we are reasoning with his

[3] The Book of Job Interpreted, by James Strahan. Edinburgh, 1913. (Page 215.) "Still another class of unfortunates —poor, scantily-clad day-laborers, starving in the midst of plenty, because their rapacious masters—the 'sweaters' of ancient times—refuse, though corn and oil and wine abound, to give them a living wage."

class, we do well to hold him up as an example. His employees had a "cause," and dared to maintain it before him, and when he answered, they answered back, "contended" with him. He never "despised" their cause by claiming that he had nothing to arbitrate; for he knew and felt the force of the rule of three. "As my servants are to their master, so am I, God's servant, to my master." And then he reasoned *a fortiori,* from less to greater. "The two ratios of this proportion are vastly unequal after all. My laborers and I are of one blood, for God hath made us so; from the womb up, we are measured by the level of a common humanity. But I and my Creator! how could I meet him in judgment if I had despised my brother instead of being, as I have been, my brother's keeper?" The application to our time does not vary in principle by a hair's breadth if instead of a single laborer it is a committee of laborers who maintain their cause. Every capitalist should listen to the sublime thunder-peal of another great poet (Isa. 10: 1–3):

"Woe unto them that turn aside the needy from justice, and rob the poor of my people of their right, that widows may be their spoil and that they may make the fatherless their prey! And what will ye do in the day of visitation, and in the desolation which shall come from afar? to whom will ye flee for help? and where will ye leave your glory?"

D. L. Moody said that there was a great desert in the middle of most people's Bibles; meaning what we call the minor prophets. If those who uphold the tyranny of our present industrial order would like to see themselves in a mirror and to know what God really thinks of them, let them read and ponder those few pages.

We gain less, however, by denouncing men who have been caught in the meshes of an evil system, than by bringing the system itself to the touchstone of Christ's teaching, which is the standard in this entire discussion. The system is huge and hard and cold as an iceberg; but the Sun of Righteousness will dissolve it by a single penetrating ray.

"One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren."

Words could not be simpler than these that

were dropped into the ears of a few fishermen; but their line is gone out into all the earth, and the world is being tested and transformed by them. The program of Christ, as we saw in Part I, is the transformation of the whole world by a united brotherhood; this is the meaning of Christian unity. Since all power in heaven and on earth is given to Christ, it is only a question of time when his kingdom will be dominant. We can speed it on, if we belong to the capitalistic class, by regarding ourselves as employers not of labor but of laborers—an apparently slight but really vast difference. We have the stewardship not so much of machines as of men; and just as we should be uneasy if our brothers in the flesh, our mothers' own children, were working for us at wages too low to give them decent subsistence, and were housed in unsanitary tenements; so, as soon as our eyes are opened, we cannot tolerate such conditions among these brothers in the spirit. At great cost, if need be, to ourselves, we shall bear one another's burdens, for by such bearing and

sharing we fulfil the law of Christ; and hereby we know and show that we are his disciples.

Now the sword of the Son of Man has two edges (Rev. 1 : 16) ; it is equally sharp against unfaithful employers and unfaithful workmen. When we reason with the latter class, it is important to put them on their guard against such bitter criticisms of those more favored in life as will blind them to the finger of God that points out their own duty. "How will thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and behold, a beam is in thine own eye?" Working-men will hasten to assure us that the mote belongs to them and the beam to their oppressors; but Jesus intended each of us to hold his own faults so close to the eye of conscience that they would look larger than the faults of his neighbors. Look at envy, for instance, which should never be confounded with emulation, its exact opposite. Emulation is a noble passion, since it strives to excel by raising itself; envy is a malignant passion, since it strives to excel by pulling down others. It

should suffice to call attention to the singular stupidity of envy. Why should we envy any man his debts? Each dollar and each other item in the inventory of the man we envy is simply an obligation to render service to God and humanity.

Again, God requires truth in the inward parts, honesty and fidelity in work. If some human organization requires dawdling, sloppy, inefficient work, if it goes so far even as to counsel fraud and sabotage, it takes no great amount of common-sense to see which authority is superior. The portrait of that private soldier who disobeyed his commander to obey his king hangs in the gallery of heroes (II Samuel 18:9–12).

We may sympathize to the full with the hardships and sufferings of the toiling millions; but we are never to do evil that good may come. The manly way, Christ's way, is to do right and take the consequences. "It is never right to do wrong and never wrong to do right."

Such generalities may have been all that

Christianity could have contributed to the solution of the labor problem a generation ago; but meanwhile the evils of the whole industrial system have grown acute, and righteous public sentiment is slowly advancing to the point of determining to mend or end it. There can be no question that it is able to do either of these things, when it is sure which is right; for the Almighty God does not live in the sky but in the hearts of his children; and in our age he reveals himself most fully in righteous public sentiment. If those whose chief end is to maintain the claims of either capital or labor are shortsighted enough to antagonize that sentiment, they are simply sawing off the limb they sit on, between themselves and the tree. And this they will do if they perpetrate injustice while clamoring against it; they should meditate on that word of Gamaliel: "lest haply ye be found even to fight against God" (Acts 5: 39). The way to fight *with* God is to contend for universal brotherhood, for the rights of man as man; the way to fight the devil's own battle is to

try either to crush out the entire capitalistic class, after the program of the mis-called Industrial Workers of the World (for "workers" read "warriors") or else to crush out all trade unions and labor federations, and thus deprive the workingmen of their one chance to rise.

Plain words should be spoken to a sluggish Christian public, whose indolent sympathies have gone too often to the capitalistic side in these industrial contests because the subject has not been thought through. The phrase "the open shop" has a large and liberal sound; "the closed shop" seems narrow and exclusive. It is proclaimed as though it were a mathematical certainty that any man has the right to work for whom he pleases on such conditions as both parties please to make. Not only is this not axiomatic, it is not even true. It is a special case under the larger untruth that any man has the right to do what he pleases. That is blasphemy against the kingdom of God, which is a social kingdom, a solid, with three dimensions; first, no man is

to live to himself; second, every man is to love his neighbor as himself; third, every man is to love God with all his heart. Perfect liberty is only found in perfect obedience to those precepts (see Ps. 119: 45; I Cor. 7: 22).

Let us see how this works out in practise. The memory of men now living covers almost the whole enormous industrial expansion caused by ever new inventions of machinery, and an ever growing concentration of capital. This development has been so sudden and so vast that the great world of toilers has been caught between the upper and the nether mill-stone; for whether business is carried on by fierce competitions or by gentlemen's agreements, in either case the huge volume of wealth produced rolls steadily (the bulk of it) into the coffers of the few who direct the work or invest their capital in it, while the army of laborers who have the larger share in production do not succeed in gaining a fair share of the product. I say "the larger share" and "a fair share" advisedly, in opposition, first to

those who claim that the wage-workers produce the total product (for there is no such thing as a scissor; it takes the two blades to cut); in opposition, next, to those who claim that distribution is equitable as it now is; for such are living in a fool's paradise, deaf to the thunder that mutters all around the horizon. Most men who think as well as feel perceive and admit that the present system or lack of system which has prevailed in the main for the last century leaves the individual workman helpless. His whole life is literally in his own hands; there is but a step between him and death every day; and as he usually has (and ought to have) a family to support, that step involves their lives as well as his own. In the old days when a man was jack at all trades, he could turn his hand to this or that, and eke out a support somehow. We have changed all that by our intricate division of labor; helplessness is not too strong a word to express the condition of a laborer out of employment. The sensible and hopeful solution is being attempted, all over the world, slowly

and on a large scale. Men group together in organizations, and seek to substitute collective for individual bargaining. Wise employers see not only the justice and fairness, but also the good policy of this plan, and are gradually coming to adopt it. As a consequence in many industries, wages are rising and the condition of workmen is improving. A little steady thinking shows that this project can succeed only when the men stand together; if individuals break away and accept lower wages or longer hours, healthful progress is checked.

On the other hand, bargaining is bargaining, and it sometimes overreaches itself. Just as a child tries to grasp more oranges than it can hold and loses them all, the unions have often put their claims higher than business will bear, and after a stubborn strike they have had to be content with lower wages. This was a frequent experience in the past; so frequent that the power of capital was much strengthened by these struggles, and wealth tended still more rapidly to consolidate in

fewer and fewer hands. At the present time, organized labor is coming to a clearer understanding of what can and what cannot be obtained; and it is capital that surrenders oftenest. But the waste in all these trials of strength is enormous; it is like nothing so much as the waste of war, to which it is often compared; and this waste is so needless as to be truly lamentable. For it is as clear as the noonday sun that the best interests of both sides are served when they help each other rather than when they fight each other. No reasonable workman can expect a man who has spent thousands of dollars and years of time in making his brains capable of grappling with the intricacies of a great business to get less out of the business than he has put into it. It is equally true that no employer can expect his men to pinch their families down to want and suffering in the face of the abundant resources of America. If it is claimed that there is not enough for all, the claim cannot be allowed for a moment. Looking back fifty years, we see that the

wealth of America has increased many times faster than the population. Where has this wealth gone? Partly to able-bodied people who work neither with hands nor head; and this is all wrong; if any will not work, neither should he eat. Partly to faithful workers in every calling; and this is all right; the laborer is worthy of his hire. But a very large part of it has been absorbed by "undesirable citizens," financial magnates and kings of vast estates and colossal trusts, as unmoved by the misery of their neighbors as Dives in the parable. This evil will never be settled until it is settled right. What has been absorbed can be reabsorbed. Great bodies move slowly, but the great body of Americans have become thoroughly persuaded that though the heavens fall, justice must be done to all classes in our brotherhood, and they will find or make a way to secure it. A few years of equitable taxation would puncture the swollen fortunes and lift the submerged tenth out of the slough of despond. Whether the land tax, advocated so ably by Henry George, or

some even more comprehensive and effective plan will commend itself to our fellow-countrymen, who hold the solution in their own hands, time will soon disclose. Meanwhile, the fact that each of us has a calling bears distinctly on the problem before us.

For it must not be supposed that factory owners and workers are alone concerned; we are all in the same body politic; if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it. Nothing in America can long resist the aroused force of public opinion; even the liquor traffic, though so strongly intrenched in a popular appetite, is losing ground every year. The question raised a few pages back, "how can *my* calling promote the kingdom of God?" we are to answer by throwing ourselves heartily into the struggle for the economic enfranchisement of our fellow-men. Many of them have already won out to a fair degree of comfort in their lives and homes. Others we can cheer by our personal touch, by making our convictions known, by stirring up friends, by agitation through the press, by

strict fairness and honesty in all our own dealings, and by preaching in season and out of season the worth of man as man. Most Americans mean to do what is right when they ascertain it; and though the problems of society are many and complicated, there is no justification for pleading that fact against the plain duty of uniting all friends of righteousness in a crusade against unwholesome tenements, starvation wages, occupational diseases, child labor, and direful poverty. Where strife has failed, brotherhood will win.

It is only fair to say, in concluding this chapter, that one of the easiest things in the world would be to compile long lists of books and articles advocating all sides of the subject treated. The chief reason why I do not present such a bibliography is that I believe it will be of more benefit to my readers to think than to cram.

CHAPTER V

THE STATE

ANTÆUS, says the fable, was a Libyan giant, offspring by Neptune of Terra, the earth. Whenever he was thrown in wrestling, he merely fell upon the bosom of his mother, whose touch caused him to leap up with fresh vigor.

Each department of human life belongs to the kingdom of God. It has sprung from his creative fiat, and being renewed by his continual Providence, it is invincible to all its foes; against whom there is a common talisman for the Home, the School, the Calling, the State:—"if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it."

The State is of God. We distinguish between the State and the administration, which often misrepresents it even to caricature.

The administration is a tangible thing; the State is a spiritual thing. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, whenever the voice of the people is the voice of God; for justice is his voice, and (notwithstanding the abuse of this Scripture) the powers that be are ordained of God. The mediæval notion that the ruler is the State (*l'état, c'est moi!*) is being shattered into fragments by the terrible war in Europe. The so-called great powers have massed against each other huge murderous armies

> "disgorging foul
> Their devilish glut, chained thunderbolts and hail
> Of iron globes." (Paradise Lost, VI 588–590.)

What they cannot destroy is the State. What they will probably destroy is autocracy. Never was there a clearer case in history of vaulting ambition overleaping itself. The enormous cruelty, together with the shocking futility, of these sacrifices to Moloch, can hardly fail to work out the deliverance of humanity from the nightmare of war. God grant it may be soon! I make no claim

to the gift of prophecy, but I was glad to note at the outset of the struggle the drift of thoughtful minds toward the conclusion that alike in Russia, Austria, and Germany, the pyramid of government, which has been anxiously balanced upon its point from time immemorial, is at last to be "broad based upon the people's will."

"One probability stands out so clearly as almost to wear the guise of a certainty. It is that this war is to be followed by immense popular upheavals. These will take the form of determined protests against militarism, and also against autocratic government. The vast, half articulate masses will no longer consent to be thought of as merely food for cannon whenever their besotted rulers give the signal for carnage."—New York *Evening Post,* August 13, 1914.

"As long as any nation or any sovereign in Europe retains the power or the will to devastate an unhappy neighbor as Germany has done to Belgium, or to plunge a continent into war without warning, as Austria has done to Europe, so long is any peace in the real sense of the word a social impossibility. . . .

This monstrous growth of militarism must fall if civilization is to endure. It is falling now, and the more complete and costly its death-throes, and the more of dynastic jealousies and 'divine' rights it pulls down and buries with it, the freer will the field be for the growth of a real peace which can only have its roots in the brotherhood of man." —The *Churchman,* August 15, 1914.[1]

[1] Twenty-five years ago, Woodrow Wilson compressed these doctrines into a sentence of six words: "Monarchies exist only by democratic consent." (The State, Boston, 1889, p. 609.) It

However high the probability of such forecasts, we have to admit that they stop short of certainty. But there is one certainty in the future; that the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdom of our Lord. That abutment stands firm, and it indicates the direction of the bridge over which civilization is to pass. Kings and empires come and go, but the word of our God shall stand forever.

Now the phrase which closes the quotation just given from the *Churchman,* "the brotherhood of man," is synonymous with "the kingdom of God," as we have seen in the first part of this book. It follows that the bridge which extends from the point where we now stand to the goal of history must be built on the lines of universal brotherhood if it is to connect with the only pier that can make it secure at its farther extremity. To attempt

is remarkable that Franz Oppenheimer's recent book with the same title (Indianapolis, 1914), proceeding on wholly different lines, comes out at so similar results. "The 'State' of the future will be society guided by self-government" (p. 275). "This has been the path of the suffering and of the salvation of humanity . . . from war to peace, from the hostile splitting up of the hordes to the peaceful unity of mankind, from brutality to humanity, from the exploiting State of robbery to the Freemen's Citizenship" (p. 290).

its construction at any other angle would be to commit the folly of the man in Luke 6:49, who without a foundation built his house upon the sand. The bridge of conquest, for instance, can never reach the abutment of God's consummated kingdom, nor can the bridge of tyranny, or the bridge of selfish ambition. It may be objected that this is to paint the future in the rainbow colors of what we hope for, and to shut our eyes to the evidence of what we see all about us. I grant the force of the objection, and admit that my faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. But this is a hard-headed, common-sense faith; the faith that the architects of the future are not going to be such dunces as to attempt a zigzag bridge instead of projecting a bee line to the goal. This faith is confirmed by sighting back along a few prominent piers in the past march of civilization. There is Magna Charta, which lifts the meadows of Runnymede higher than the Himalayas. Never has there been since, and never can there be again

in England, a King John with his whims to tilt against English freedom. "No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any otherwise destroyed, nor will we pass upon him, nor send upon him, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or delay to any man, justice or right."

Four hundred years later another compact was struck, which exalts the *Mayflower* till it dominates all the dreadnoughts of all the navies. Mr. Bancroft has something to say about that abutment.[2]

"The Pilgrims were Englishmen, Protestants, exiles for religion, men disciplined by misfortune, cultivated by opportunities of extensive observation, equal in rank as in rights, and bound by no code but that of religion or the public will. . . . They formed themselves into a body politic by a solemn voluntary compact" (which he then quotes, and proceeds):—"This instrument was signed by the whole body of men, forty-one in number, who with their families constituted the one hundred, the whole colony, the 'proper democracy' that arrived in New England. This was the birth of popular constitutional liberty. The middle age had been familiar with charters and con-

[2] History of the United States, I, 308–310.

stitutions but they had been merely compacts for immunities, partial enfranchisements, patents of nobility, concessions of municipal privileges, or limitations of the sovereign power in favor of feudal institutions. In the cabin of the *Mayflower,* humanity recovered its rights, and instituted government on the basis of 'equal rights' for the 'general good'."

In this last sentence, wny does Mr. Bancroft say that humanity *re*covered instead of *dis*covered its rights? For a partial answer, we look back thousands of years to another signal monument of history. Though so remote, it is plainly visible. It is Mount Sinai in Arabia.

"For special ends, not here necessary to detail, God proposed to be the civil ruler as well as the tutelar Deity of the Hebrews, and was formally accepted as such by the popular voice. A constitution or platform of government was also proposed and formally adopted, and a solemn ratification of the whole and inauguration of the government occurred. . . . In this one instance only has God assumed such a relation. And in this, he so sanctioned and regarded popular rights, that he admitted the sovereignty of the Jewish people, and would not himself take the rule over the nation except by their express consent. Had the nation refused to accept the offer, it would have been the sin of ingratitude and contempt of such distinguished favor, but not the crime of rebellion against political sovereignty. Here, a thousand years before the time of Pericles, is the most ancient and valid recognition of the rights of popular freedom. We can better afford to lose all the examples of free institutions in Greece and Rome, than

this one divine acknowledgment of the sovereign right of a people to determine their own form of government." [3]

Two points suffice to determine a straight line, but we have found already five points in the same straight line along the causeway of progress. They are Sinai, Runnymede, Provincetown, the present moment, and the great consummation. It must be conceded that there have been a multitude of deviations from this line of progress, for "men will not go right till they have tried all possible ways of going wrong." The causeway is washed on either side by a surging gulf, strewn with the wrecks of people and peoples that have built on other foundations, from Pharaoh's host to the impending wreck in Europe. But the hour is coming when even the militant Germans will find shelter under their own true proverb:

"Der gerade Weg ist der beste."

We are better able now than before to answer the question that has been pressing upon us: "What is the State?" It is humanity

[3] L. P. Hickok, A System of Moral Science. (Boston, 1887.)

organized for government. Translated into popular speech out of Kant's philosophical definition of an organism (see page 101), the State is the brotherhood of mankind. The question what is *a* State? requires a different answer, a reference to a division of humanity into populations, each owning allegiance to a central authority; or, as in the United States, to a subdivision of such a division, for example, the State of South Dakota. There are still wheels within these wheels, city governments and town governments. All these are to be considered as means of grace; we are concerned with them here in their relation to the kingdom of God. Let us begin with the inner circle, municipal government.

I select for illustration two cities which are very far apart, while yet their likenesses are as important as their differences, the cities of Jerusalem and Philadelphia. They are separated, it is true, by more than a hundred degrees of longitude, but it is latitude rather than longitude that signifies. Put them equally far apart, one in the arctic zone, the

other in the torrid, and we should not think of comparing them. As, however, there are only eight degrees' difference of latitude, the climatic conditions are similar. Both cities are extremely warm in summer; on the other hand, I have never felt so raw a March wind in Philadelphia, as that which penetrated to the very marrow on the day I left Jerusalem. It may be claimed that the difference of origin and character separates these cities far more effectually than that of position on the map.

"Jerusalem belongs to far antiquity; she lives on her past and moulders within her ancient walls. Her own people are ground down in hopeless poverty and misery, under the heel of an alien race of conquerors, who spurn all rights but their own. Philadelphia is thousands of years younger, the birthplace of liberty and the home of freedom, where all men are equal; a city of law and order and of the highest civilization, throbbing with the life of to-day, and reaching out with hope to greet the morrow."

It is evident that this hypothetical speaker has never gone to Jerusalem. If he had, he would have seen a modern city which long ago overflowed its walls, and which annually stretches out farther into the open country; a

city with banks and hotels, libraries and scientific institutions; with five post-offices, and twelve consulates, and railroad and telegraph facilities. As to law and order, is it wise for Philadelphia to boast over other cities? Not until time has proved that the present wave of reform is more dependable than that of 1906. In the matter of race domination, is it seemly for her to throw stones at Jerusalem? Perhaps she would be better employed in pondering another of the good books that ought to be better known: *The Philadelphia Negro, a Social Study,* by Professor W. E. B. Dubois.[4] This is a large octavo of more than five hundred pages, a cool, scientific collection of facts that cannot be contravened, leading up to the inescapable conclusion: "The situation is a disgrace to the city—a disgrace to its Christianity, to its spirit of justice, to its commonsense. What can be the end of such a policy but increased crime and increased excuse for crime; increased poverty and more reason to be poor; increased political serfdom of the

[4] Published in 1899 by the University of Pennsylvania.

mass of black voters to the bosses and rascals who divide the spoils?"

The last count in that indictment has a direct bearing on the subject of this chapter, The State. Jerusalem can teach us here, as Job taught us on the industrial question. Philadelphia, it is true, rang the bell which proclaimed liberty throughout all the land—a direct corollary from the brotherly love of her founder; but where did she get that principle? It was in the temple courts of Jerusalem that a Great Prophet put forth, as the core and summary of all law between man and man, an utterance which rose in the night like a silver star that will never set:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Here is the only, and at the same time the perfect, solution for the political problems of the city and the state, the nation and the world. Deist though he was, Jefferson testified that he derived his practical conceptions of civil liberty from the actual working of the doctrine of equal rights in a little Baptist

church in Virginia, where all were members one of another.

We are searching, in every case, not for a "problem" but for a help; a means for the diffusion of the gospel of brotherhood. When Christianity was young, the cities of the Roman world were a potent help to that diffusion. It was a sound and rational instinct—not to add, an inspiration from above—which led Paul and his fellow-apostles to centre their efforts in the great cities, where neighborhood was most manifest, where the leaven would work most effectually, where Roman law was supreme, where the civil polity itself was often a means of grace. Men in our day of like fidelity and equal concentration of purpose, men like General Booth and Dr. McAll and Jacob Riis, who can say "this one thing I do," have achieved results not only in penetrating the darkness of great cities with the light of love, but in making these very cities effective engines for the propagation of the truth as it is in Jesus.

The principle being the same, we can leap

logically from the local view to the world view. The voice from heaven that cried when Jesus was born: "on earth peace, good will toward men," sounded the reveille to a sleeping world. The world awoke and laughed the message to scorn. Governments made themselves merry over the new gospel, or killed and burned the peacemakers. Both the principle and the policy of universal peace were never more scornfully derided by the powers that hold the front of the stage than at the present moment. "Look," they say, "at the alacrity with which the multitudes who had been declaiming against war sprang to arms when the tocsin sounded." True, but the mills of God grind slowly! It was with reference to similar circumstances that our Lord proclaimed, "the end is not yet." Out of the turmoil will emerge a new heaven and a new earth. It is impossible for the strong man of the parable to prevail against the stronger than he; force is not so mighty as brotherhood.

"A reborn race appears—a perfect world—all joy!
War, sorrow, suffering gone—the rank earth purged."

There have been times when Christian civilization seemed much nearer its doom than it seems in 1915. But when the enemy came in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord lifted up a standard against him. If we would accustom ourselves to walk by faith instead of by sight; if we truly believed in the God who is not in the empty void we call the sky, but who moves in a mysterious way through the very heart of mankind, we should feel no alarm at the spectacle of the raging nations. Rather should we read therein the speedy triumph of that democracy which spells humanity, and the speedy overthrow of that fiendishness which thinks to settle truth and right by human slaughter. We should take the celestial view of the present distress: "Wo to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, *because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.*" (Rev. 12: 12.)

Let us boldly accept the challenge of the

god Thor, and rejoice in the national democracy already achieved as an earnest and foretaste of the world democracy that is to be.

"For mankind are one in spirit and an instinct bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's vast frame
Through its ocean-sundered fibres feels the gush of joy or shame;—
In the gain or loss of one race, all the rest have equal claim."

CHAPTER VI

THE BIBLE

We pass from the unconventional means of grace to things more commonly considered to be such means. And first the Bible.

This is an age that questions everything, and nothing more freely and frequently than the divine authority of the Christian Scriptures. It cannot be denied that much danger and damage are incurred in connection with the criticism of the Old and New Testaments; but great will be the astonishment of the people who commonly make this complaint when they learn that it is they, and not the critics, who are to blame, and who are in danger of incurring and inflicting the damage. Among the best friends of the Bible are its critics, while those who object to criticism are friends well-meaning, but injudicious. Their error, which resembles that of Uzzah, is due to one or both of two causes; ignorance of what criti-

cism is and want of acquaintance with the critics. Beginning with the latter, I present a bit of testimony. It has been my privilege, as well as duty, to know personally the leading biblical critics of America for the last thirty years, besides a number who belong to other countries. They have no horns nor hoofs, but are Christian gentlemen. The one thing which best characterizes them as a class and as individuals is their sincere devotion to the truth. One of the ablest and most level-headed of them, who has lately gone to his reward, I counted among my warm friends; Professor Willis J. Beecher, whom I have mentioned in another connection (page 42). Among the reasons why our country is not likely to be swept away by irreverent and irrational notions about the Bible, one of the chief is the great bulwark which Professor Beecher raised, in the thorough training of a whole generation of ministers and other students, by his courses of biblical criticism in the weekly issues of the *Sunday School Times*. That remark involves the other count of the

indictment, ignorance of what criticism is. It is nothing more nor less than commonsense judgment, either about the Bible or any other subject. Critics come honestly to the most diverse and opposite results, but criticism itself is a set of processes, not of results; these processes are perilous only to those who are afraid of the truth. To illustrate by beginning where we are all agreed: the book known as the Bible did not, as a book, come down out of heaven. Moreover, there is no great man in the sky to hand down even a portion of it. I remember well with what a start I once awoke to realize the fact that I no longer believed that a man named Moses climbed a mountain and received directly from the hands of some one named God two heavy stones, written by the literal finger of this same God.

"But does not the Bible say, distinctly and emphatically, that the ten commandments *were* written by the finger of God?"

Indeed it does; and Emerson says, as distinctly and emphatically, that the shot fired

at Concord was heard round the world. As a matter of fact, it was not even heard at Winchester, only ten miles away. What is true to fact may be false to truth. The embattled farmers *did* make themselves heard around the world, and the ten commandments *are* God's own law. Be on your guard against what Professor Beecher calls "the baby-story theory of the Bible." It conceives, for instance, that the Israelites, when they had come out of Egypt, marched back and forth for forty years through a barren desert, in solid column like a Salvation Army regiment, and that they were fed only on bread from heaven with an occasional quail. The truth probably is that they were scattered all over an immense pasture land, whereon their cattle subsisted, while they subsisted on the flesh and milk of their cattle as well as on the manna; the latter being a sign, not a *sine qua non.*

It should be remembered also that the word critic means judge, not advocate. Too many would-be critics are judge-advocates, the em-

phasis falling on the second word of the compound. Some of them are never so happy as when they think they have put the biblical writers "in a hole," by fathering upon them the above and similar baby-story theories. The writers of the Old Testament were mostly prophets or men of prophetic spirit. They have their own theory of Israel's national development, a theory which is reverent, consistent, and reasonable. The judge-advocate school of critics has an entirely opposite theory, which some other critics consider irreverent, inconsistent and unreasonable. The position of the former class of critics should be met, not by denouncing them as atheists and casting them out of the church, but by answering their arguments, which are often strong as well as plausible.

One of the neglected good books—the best, I think, on this especial phase of the question—is called *The Early Religion of Israel*.[1] A singular "result of criticism" is that no thorough-going answer to it has ever been attempted, so far as I know.

[1] By Professor James Robertson. London, 1892.

What now is the Bible? It is so precious that we cannot bear to have it abused and misrepresented, as though it were a sacred fetish, instead of a living voice. The Bible is a growth, a library. God is in it and man is in it. When its writers penned their great truths, God was not outside of them, but was closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet; he was in their very minds. On the other hand, it is not to be denied for a moment that God was at the same time infinitely above them. German critical scholarship has given terse expression to the need of blending in one the thought of God's transcendence and that of his immanence; denying the former, we land in pantheism; denying the latter, in deism. The every-day Christian believes in God's providence, and so is in little danger of deism; no more will he forget the divine transcendence if he prays every day: "Our Father, who art in heaven."

Biblical criticism, like any other, is either lower or higher. The former has respect to the true reading of passages (for instance,

John 1 : 18, "the only-begotten Son," or "God only-begotten") ; the latter goes back of the text to sources and circumstances (for instance, what can we learn about the previous prevalence of the idea of a divine begetting?). Now this last procedure belongs to the realm of science, and it need not and should not concern the average Christian at all. When he reads in Eph. 5 : 2, "Walk in love, as Christ also loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor," he understands this call, and resolves to follow Christ by walking in love, even to sacrifice. When some higher critic tells him that this idea of a sweet-smelling savor goes back to the statement in Genesis that Jehovah smelled the sweet savor of Noah's offering, and that that goes back to the Babylonian account of the deluge, which relates that the gods scented the sacrifice and came flocking around it like flies, his indignation knows no bounds; he straightway pronounces a curse upon the higher critics and all their works. But that critic is on a par

with another, who maintains that joining the hands in marriage is a relic of the savage custom of seizing a wife from the enemy; and he is on a par with still another, who holds that human love itself is a development from brute passion. The true answer in each case is, "What of it? If the flower grew out of the mud, it was born of the sunlight as truly." It is not the remote origin of love but its present essence that most concerns us. We know that love is life, and that mere passion is the death of love. Let the sociologists go on investigating the origin of marriage, while we ever keep the vow and covenant we have truly made with our wives. Let critical science delve freely into the dim traditions of pagan ceremonies, while we believe and are sure that sacrificial devotion cannot be accounted for by that mud; hereby perceive *we* love, because he laid down his life for us.

We are indebted to the so-called destructive criticism for destroying some religious customs that were foolish or worse. It was once believed—and there are still many who will

assent to the proposition if it is stated in general terms—that the precepts of the Bible are as binding on us as they were on those to whom they were first given. But when we begin to particularize, they draw back at once. All over Christendom, two or three centuries ago, the very explicit command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live" was obeyed with strict fidelity; as a result, hundreds of innocent people, especially on the continent of Europe, were executed without mercy. Their blood cried out against this barbarity, but cried in vain for many a long year. Biblical criticism shows that that statute has no standing in our age.

Unintentional cruelty on a small scale was manifested by our fathers when they steeled their hearts, and continued to ply the rod, because they had read in the book of Proverbs, "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." But the scholarly critics who produced the Revised Version give the true translation: "do not set thy heart upon his death." In my boyhood,

it was a common thing for a devout person to open the Bible at random, expecting to put his finger on a passage which would bring a special revelation to him. But this is to use the Bible not as a means of grace but as a game of chance. Akin to that undignified searching of Scripture, because resting on the same false notion that all parts of it are God's message to us, was the practise (still somewhat prevalent) of reading the whole Bible through, a chapter at a time, in family worship. A fellow-student, in my college days, gave an effectual illustration of the absurdity of this custom. We were spending a Sunday at a farm-house in the country, where it was the law of the house that each member of the family, including the stranger within the gates, should read in turn at prayers. The regular progression had brought up for that day the seventh chapter of Numbers, with its eighty-nine verses, giving twelve repetitions of the same series of offerings. All these were deliberately read through, and as there happened to be six readers, my comrade,

whose wit exceeded his reverence, had to state just a dozen times that "his offering was one silver charger, the weight whereof," etc. He improved the opportunity by putting an accent of gentle surprise on the word *his,* as though each tribal chief had brought something new.

But enough of these examples of how not to use the Bible; one sees at a glance that our host might easily have chosen a real word of God, that would have been living and powerful in the heart of that careless young man.

If it be granted that biblical criticism may be a means of grace, it is clearer still that the Bible itself may be a most powerful means of grace.[2] I take for granted the essential factor of co-operation on the part of the student, for even the Bible does not work by magic; it takes two to make it work effectually. You are to work out your own salvation while God is working in you. No such lazy method as reading a chapter today and

[2] The phrase "the Bible as a means of grace" occurs repeatedly in Professor Ladd's excellent book, What Is the Bible? (New York, 1888.)

forgetting it tomorrow, or as reading here and there at random, putting Chronicles on a level with John, will make the Bible a powerful means of grace.

But here I shall be reminded of Paul's declaration (II Tim. 3: 16), "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." When a man quotes that passage as a proof-text, he is attempting to reason; it will not do for him to deny this and say he is appealing only to faith. The truth is, he advances two syllogisms. *First:* "Whatever Paul says is so; Paul says that all parts of the Bible are given by inspiration of God; therefore they are." *Second:* "Whatever is given by inspiration of God is profitable for us; but we have proved that every part of the Bible is so given; therefore we shall be profited, whatever part we take." The argument is as full of flaws as an egg is of meat. Neglecting other fallacies, note that this is what the author of the epistle said; Every God-breathed writing is also profitable for teaching, etc. "First catch your hare"; i. e., be sure you have a God-breathed writing

before you draw inferences from it. An eloquent barrister once exclaimed: "You know, gentlemen of the jury, we have the highest authority for saying, All that a man hath will he give for his life." His opponent proved from the second chapter of Job that the learned brother's highest authority was Satan!

Seriously, how can we distinguish what are God's words in the Bible from what are not? We cannot at all, in the case of every sentence, but nothing depends on such an ability. The Bible is to be taken not only in homeopathic doses but in large portions, with an appetite like that for our food (Job 23: 12). Look at this same book of Job, where the sophistries of the friends are sometimes met by Job's own imprecations against God that reach almost to blasphemy. And yet the great trend of the book is intensely religious. The average Christian has not the faintest conception of its marvellous power; not because it is out of his reach but because he has not absorbed it as a whole. Even if he never reads the Bible through, he ought to read the book of Job

entire some Sunday afternoon. It will haunt him through the week, and the next Sunday he will read it again; and after he has read it a few times, no one can persuade him that that book was not given by inspiration of God. An eminent college professor used to say that one play of Shakespeare's read fifty times was better than the whole series read once. I verily believe that no reasonable being will continue to shut God out of his life, when he has read the book of Job fifty times.

Pass from Job to Jeremiah. The average Christian calls him the weeping prophet, and objects to "jeremiads." How far short he falls of appreciating the statesmanship of that man of God, that tower of strength in the day of Jerusalem's crisis. One does not need to go to the commentaries for this; it is all plainly to be read in the book, the most interesting autobiography I know. All the greatest patriots of history—Dante, Mazzini, Cromwell, Lafayette, Washington—would rise up before Jeremiah and give him the place of honor in their company. And how

the average man misapprehends the beautiful little book of Jonah; making it the subject of unseemly jests because he is blind to its message of divine grace. The very theme of the book is that God loves the world; that he is patient and full of compassion, not merely for our set but for them that are far off. There were God-breathed men before there were God-breathed writings.

If it were possible to summon a stout-hearted unbeliever into a witnessing assembly, comprising Jeremiah with all the goodly fellowship of the prophets, Paul with all the glorious company of the apostles, the authors of the books of Job and Jonah with all the inspired writers of holy Scripture, would he not yield to their fervent appeals? Could he fail to accept their united testimony: "we are God's ambassadors, as though God did beseech you by us?" If he heeded them not, neither would he be persuaded though one rose from the dead. And he has them all in his own home. Suppose, instead, that he was surrounded by the prophets of Baal and of

Mohammed and of Buddha; what a descent![2] Herein we begin to perceive the unique majesty of the Bible, but only *begin* to perceive it. We have not yet made the great ascent to its loftiest mountain peak. The bibles of other religions have no Christ. The poet Lanier found something to forgive in them all, while the music of his fine alliteration lingers in our ears: "thou crystal Christ." The sweetest message of *our* Bible tells us that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to save it. Imagine every copy of the Scriptures lost and all their contents blotted out of human memory. There is one thing that would not go, the conscience. A good conscience is a trusty friend, but a guilty conscience is the most terrible of enemies. In the case supposed, we should see a hapless world, lost in sin, gnawed by remorse, seeking deliverance and finding none. As surely as our Father's name is love, he would restore

[2] In a company of biblical scholars, I heard a learned Arabist declare that in all Mohammedan literature, to say nothing of the worthless and wicked parts of it, there is not a single moral or spiritual truth that had not been previously given in the Bible; "it is all there," he said.

what we had lost; he would give us back the Bible, to reveal to our inmost hearts his Son, Jesus Christ the Redeemer, manifested to take away our sin; and the whole earth would ring with the chorus, Hallelujah! what a Saviour!

Thus far in this chapter, we may have seemed to be turning aside from the main goal of the book, but every step has brought us nearer to it. The meaning of Christian unity, and the true formula for securing it, are now as clear as the daylight. For we cannot be satisfied with any partial unity which stops short of our whole fallen race. To quote again the words of Bishop Rhinelander:[3] "always, and in everything, it is fellowship, or unity, that Christians seek; more unity, and more fellowship, because they are bound to be dissatisfied till all the race is one."

When will the race be one? When, and only when, it is one in Christ. This is the practical task before Christians; and a practical way to accomplish it is to make the fullest possible use of the *life* of Christ, for which

[3] See p. 68.

the Bible is our only original source. Wherever that book shines into the darkness of heathenism, Christ makes conquests; sometimes with, sometimes without, the voice of the living preacher. The soul that has been groping in that darkness reads in the new book: "Christ Jesus is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption." He tries it and finds it true. He may have been a follower of some ethnic religion that contained a certain measure of *wisdom;* but *redemption* he never had known. To look into the faces of a group of Hindus, a little before and a little after they have come to Christ, is to see a marvellous transformation, a conclusive proof of the victory of grace. God was the author of that grace and the Bible was the means of grace. It will continue its peaceful and radical conquests until the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. And its spread is intensive as well as extensive, personal as truly as cosmic. Not only is the world the subject of redemption but the soul

is the subject of redemption. The kingdom of heaven is like leaven as well as like a mustard-seed. The Bible says there is a fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ, and says it of an individual.

> "All *my* capacious powers can want
> In thee doth richly meet."

Besides the reading of the Bible in large portions, which I have recommended, it is an excellent practice to choose each morning some pearl of great price from the treasury of the Word, and carry it with you throughout the busy day. The Bible will give you steadiness in the nervous tension of work, courage when the heart sinks, sympathy when you are in danger of passing a wounded brother unheedingly. If it does not always bring you, as it brought Jesus, deliverance from the fierce assaults of the tempter, still it has a word for you even when you stumble and fall, the word of repentance and forgiveness.

What the Bible will do for you it will do for anybody and everybody. Because God is in it, the God who loves the whole world, it

is bound to conquer the whole world. The great message of the Bible is the faithful saying that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. It is worthy of all acceptation, that is, it ought to be received by everybody. When it is so received, Christian unity will be complete.

CHAPTER VII

THE LOCAL CHURCH

On the Isles of Shoals, one sees at intervals a simple white post with a wedge-shaped box attached to it. The eye that is fascinated by the glories of sea and shore on a September morning would hardly notice it, but for a cluster of five initials that stand for "United States Life Saving Station." We recall the famous inscription on the Eddystone Beacon, "To give light and to save life." That is what a church of Jesus Christ is for. It is a branch of the true Israel, fulfilling the prophet's word:

> "For behold, darkness shall cover the earth
> And thick darkness the people.
> But the Lord shall arise upon thee
> And his glory shall be seen upon thee.
> And nations shall come to thy light
> And kings to the brightness of thy rising."

The church exists not only to give light but to save life. Life-saving is a lofty mission,

by no means to be restricted to the salvage of wrecks. It is the business of every church to save the *whole* life, from infancy to age; the *whole* life, in all its manifold powers, that Christ may be all and in all. The church comes into close, personal grip with its community, and transforms it, by working together with God. There was a time when these very islands were addicted to gross crimes and horrible vices.[1] Today you could not find a more orderly community. The stone church on the summit of Star Island is a light-house of a higher type than the government institution on White Island, and throws its beams much farther. The great granite monument hard by the church commemorates the work of a faithful pastor. Draw a line from this point straight across the continent to California. If it were not invidious to name them, mention could be made of many a pioneer settlement along that line, in the middle and farther West, which began

[1] See Joseph Williamson's History of Maine or Celia Thaxter's Among the Isles of Shoals.

with the devil's forces in full possession—saloons, brothels, gambling dives. Then came a little band of Christians with their brave sky pilot, who knew that Satan's seat was there, but knew neither fear nor failure. Not as the conqueror comes they the true-hearted came. The struggle was none the less real because it was not a warlike clash; as in Longfellow's ballad,[2] it was "Cross against corselet, love against hatred." But it is the nature of darkness to fly from the light; over and over again the frontier has been redeemed, the spiritual desert made to blossom as the rose. Those callow sophomores and sophomoric professors who give a superior smile when the Christian church is named, and think it the height of manliness to scoff at religion, should study the making of the great West.

The local church has many forms. It may be a little company of Japanese laborers, meeting together for a service of prayer and consecration, then going out in sublime faith to evangelize an interior village where Christ

[2] See p. 30.

has never been named. From such a spiritual height, we descend through varying grades of power, down to some country church in America, with hardly faith enough to keep up its mid-week meetings, and thence a long way down to the city church on the most prominent corner of the residential district in Laodicea; a church that is strong in the statistics of the Year Book and in Pharisaic pride. Not a church in the world is so good that it ought not to be better, or so bad that it cannot be redeemed.

What "the local church" would mean if things were as they should be, is the sum of all the Christian forces in a local region, a parish. That is the way Christianity began; for example, in the two cities I have named, Jerusalem and Philadelphia. The same is true of the large city church of which I am a member. For generations, it was the only church in its community, the only one in a radius of some miles. If the local church had always kept this range of meaning, it would be a much more potent means of grace

among the many that are working together to enhance the existent degree of Christian unity.[3] At present there are six churches in our section of the city, all covering the same territory. One of these is regarded as heretical in faith (Unitarian), another as heretical in government (Papal), by each of the other five. But Christian Unity is growing, as frequent union services between the five Protestant churches show.

In my church's original parish are scores of other churches; yet probably more than half the population of the city never darken the doors of any kind of church. It is evident that here is a fitting occasion for reform to begin, like charity, at home. Let us make a closer diagnosis. The average church invests, let us say,[4] $6,500 in its plant, whose doors are open for periods not exceeding the equivalent of sixty-five days out of the three hundred and sixty-five. It takes forty-two members of the average church to add one new member a year, and it takes sixty-

[3] See pp. 58, 68.

[4] These figures are from D. C. Tremaine's Church Efficiency, New York, 1911.

four such churches to add one church a year. The entire gain in the average church is less than three members a year; a large number of churches regularly lose instead of gain. Of the gains, eighty-two per cent. come from the Sunday School; a hopeful fact until we ascertain another fact, that only fifteen per cent. of the Sunday School membership furnish any additions at all. What becomes of the other eighty-five per cent.? To what purpose is this waste? It is true, to be sure, that the church is doing other good things besides adding to its numbers; but its chief business, according to its charter, is to make disciples (Mat. 28: 19). If a cotton factory made an equally poor output of cotton cloth, it would be cold comfort to the stockholders to add up the by-products; they would institute a thorough shake-up of methods. But when we come to these in the case before us, when we pass from diagnosis to prescription, the doctors differ widely. Some of the proposed remedies suggest the laboratory expert rather than the experienced practitioner; they are

put forth in general terms, whereas their efficacy is very restricted in extent. Consider, for example, the advice often urged so strongly, that the church building should be kept open, warm, light, and attractive, every night in the year. "That is when the young people are free; that is when the devil gets them; why not beat him at his own game? If you don't succeed at first, it only shows that you haven't made the counter-attraction strong enough. No factory could succeed if it was closed five days in six as your cold churches are."

This is fine laboratory theory. Perhaps it will be read with a grim smile next winter by some faithful country pastor who has just come home from a parish visit, having driven two miles in the night through deep snow and howling wind. He hears the storm rocking the spire and rattling the blinds of the little church on the hill above him, and even if he is equipped with a telephone, he does *not* call up the sexton to ask why he did not warm and light the church in the hope of catching the

young people. He turns to last winter's diary, and easily counts on his fingers the number of nights when the vestry could have been filled with young people by any inducement short of a turkey supper or a dance; either of which would find its more convenient and appropriate place in the village hall. Meanwhile he is smiling again at the utter folly of saddling his people with such a monstrous expense as the plan proposes. It is like the favorite remedies of some other eminent physicians; hopeless save to the rich.

"But I," exclaims a sturdy revivalist, "could have filled that church on the hill whatever the conditions; church asleep or awake, weather cold or hot, storm or starlight. I have had crowds in the largest halls in Canada when the mercury outside was forty degrees below zero, and crowds at open-air noon meetings in New Orleans when it stood at a hundred in the shade."

This testimony affords a second example of the wrong strategy which would solve a general problem out of a very limited experience.

It is pathetic to realize the impossibility of convincing our egotistical brother that much greater crowds of real Christians than he ever assembled would go a long distance out of their way to escape his meetings. His methods are warmly commended by some good people and heartily abhorred by others just as good. On these lines, Christian unity is impossible, as the science of psychology shows; men, and even women, are not all built that way. It is a condition that confronts us and not a theory. I admit that many able and influential pastors are wont to urge upon all churches the occasional employment of professional revivalists; but perhaps they will admit some exceptions, if they make themselves familiar with the life-work of the late Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler. His long ministry was wonderfully fruitful in the wise use of evangelistic methods; but he was his own evangelist, and he earnestly enjoined it on each pastor to do the work of an evangelist and make full proof of his ministry.

"The mission of the Church," says Rev.

J. O. Ashenhurst,[5] "is the building of manhood to the glory of God, and this cannot be accomplished if the Church expends its energies in periodically 'getting up a revival.' In order to reap the full fruit of evangelism, the Church must enlist all its members, including its latest converts, in helpful benevolence, philanthropy and reform, as well as earnest Bible study, and prayer-filled service for the conversion of souls."

The sum of the matter is that the question whether and when to employ a professional revivalist is largely a question of local temperament.

Books in abundance are current, setting forth the duties and responsibilities, the perils and bright hopes, of the local church, whether in city or country. A good bibliography is given by Ernest E. Elliott at the close of his little brochure.[6] From twelve to fifty volumes are mentioned under each of five divisions: Prayer and worship, Bible study,

[5] The Day of the Country Church, p. 75. New York, 1910.
[6] Making Good in the Local Church. New York, 1913.

Missions and social service, Business efficiency, Soul-winning efficiency. Many of these writers in the two departments of social service and soul-winning lay stress on the sociable atmosphere of a church, and especially on the practise of greeting newcomers and following them up. This I regard as a third case of wrong strategy, illustrating the illogical leap from particulars to generals. Here is an earnest deacon who complains to his pastor that a certain prominent person has left the congregation because so few people noticed him, and has joined a neighbor church where he will soon be made a pillar. The two officials concoct an appeal to the congregation to be "sociable" after the next service and thenceforth. Neither of them knows that an equally prominent person attends their church just because he likes to have strong truth put before him and then to go quietly home thinking it over, without being everlastingly button-holed and diverted on the way. He will disappear as quietly when that appeal is given, murmuring to himself: "one

more church of the holy gushers." Since such opposite temperaments really exist among us, efforts for Christian unity must be broad enough to include both, and especially to work with power upon the heart of the deacon in question, till he becomes so utterly free from the spirit of rivalry as to rejoice *sincerely* in each success of his neighbors, the h. g.'s. After all, sociability is such awkward business for some of us that when we attempt it we are more likely to repel than to win.

I will mention only one more of these mistaken generalizations. Nearly all the "authorities" agree that the way to cure the admitted evil of over-churching, most disastrous in small country places, is by joining two or more weak churches into one strong one, thus saving expense, developing energy, and removing the reproach of the godless. If we only had some benevolent super-pope, they say, he could effect this by edict; as it is, we must keep up our arguments and persuasions until these feeble churches are ashamed to stay apart.

The trouble with this theory in many cases is that it forgets the peculiar composition of human nature, which such efforts are apt to rub the wrong way. My own experience is so slight that I should not mention it except to ask if it may not be typical. I once became pastor of a small country church, from which another small church close by had separated many years before, on a personal controversy, the subject of which had long since died. Six days of every week, the people on both sides mingled heartily in neighborly ways; the seventh day they "worshipped the Lord" in hostile bands. Not the ghost of a reason could be given for continuing this division. The situation was too absurd to be endured, and I spent several years (with the advice and support of eminently practical church leaders outside) in all sorts of plans to change it for the better. Every such attempt, of whatever kind, produced an immediate resurgence of the old trouble and another stiffening of the wall of partition. All these efforts were merely the beating of resistible waves against

an immovable iceberg. I am persuaded that what we all ought to have done was to try to live so near the Lord Christ that the iceberg would have been gently drawn into the gulf stream of his love. Then it would matter little whether we were two bands or one, externally.

It will be wise now to turn from methods appropriate to some kinds of churches but not to others, and to consider briefly such as apply to all, such as are fitted to make all of them helpful means to promote Christian unity.

Fixing the eye, then, as in similar cases, not upon a perfect church but upon a good sample, we observe what it is doing. Horace Bushnell somewhere calls the Sunday School "the greatest work in the world." The local church we are looking at has a live Sunday School. The Bible is its great text-book, and whatever else is neglected, the spiritual truths of the Bible are winningly presented every Sunday, both from the superintendent's desk, and in the familiar converse of teacher and scholar. Little children and those of older

years sing the great hymns of the ages and learn the great words of our Lord. They are taught what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man. The Christian work of fathers and mothers in the home is not supplanted but beautifully supplemented by this Christ-like agency; and when there is no Christian home, or an ineffective one, the fish are often caught in that gospel net which we call the Sunday School. The Christian teacher in the day-school rejoices in the co-operation of her faithful Sabbath ally; the most promising triple alliance on earth is that between the home, the school, and the church, in the field of Christian nurture. The sheep are shepherded as well as the lambs; one of the most hopeful signs of the times is the success that has attended steady and tactful efforts to gather into Bible classes the men of the community who had neglected public worship.[7] When such a Sunday School is out on the frontier, it is

[7] On this subject, see a very helpful chapter in Tremaine, l.c., pp. 86–96.

pretty sure to develop into a strong and active church of Christ.

It is simply axiomatic that those who eat the same spiritual meat and drink the same spiritual drink will grow up in the unity of the Spirit; hence if our generation bends its energies to the work of planting and sustaining more and better Sunday Schools, the next generation will enter on a new heritage of Christian unity.

Every good church, we may be sure, is preaching the sound, pure gospel of righteousness and redemption, through its pulpit ministries, and is gathering its members in less formal ways for prayer and praise and Christian conference. Abundant suggestions for the betterment of all these means of grace are to be found in the standard books which treat of homiletics and pastoral theology. But, as we have already seen in the chapter on the home, the life is more than meetings. The demands of our age give strong and proper emphasis to the life of the church in the *world;* its aggressive work for and on human

society. It is a mistake to suppose that this department of activity concerns the city and not the country; every church, of whatever description, is called of God to use sanctified commonsense as salt to season its own vicinity. Take for instance what looks like a clear case to the contrary, Tremaine's admirable chapter on church advertising (l. c. pages 97–108). It seems to be calculated only for the latitude and longitude of a large city—until you reflect that the smaller the hamlet, the more thoroughly notices are scanned, even when they are only pasted on barn doors.

Now what is the good church as it faces the world, the church as a social force? The chief product of the church, as of the home, is Christian character, something you can tie to, something you can build on as on the solid rock. Mr. Ashenhurst well says (l. c. page 33):

"The practical teachings of Christianity applied to the social life of the community require business integrity, education, culture, courtesy, neighborliness, co-operation, and civic activity."

Again, page 31:

"The Church assumes no temporal authority as lord of the parish, but is rather the heart, supplying the life-blood of the gospel to every member (of the community), and inspiring the activities of moral and social progress. The chief function of the Church is to impress the truths of Christianity upon the life of the people and to infuse the principles of the gospel into every popular movement. The function of the Church is inspirational."

Yes, it is inspirational, and we may add that the spirit which the true church inspires is that of hearty, universal brotherhood.

Conceive such a local church as has just been described, and as we all, I trust, have known, and this time suppose its locus to be neither city nor country, but a small village, that revolves in all its activities on the axis of a cotton factory. Employers and employed are in harmony. Every inhabitant lives on the factory, is proud of it, sings its praises far and near. We climb a hill and look down on the village at our feet. Here is the huge mill, yonder the little church; there the humble parsonage of the Christian minister, here the stately palace of the cotton king. Try now to realize the simple truth, that for every

benefit that has its source in the factory, ten have their source in the church; nay more, that taking them singly, each gift received through the hands of the pastor is as much superior to each bestowed by the millionaire as character is better than cotton. You will be helped to see this truth if you simply imagine the civilization to be heathen instead of Christian.[8]

It follows that the major tactics of Christian unity are to be found in fostering, purifying, and multiplying everywhere, churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, each one the pillar and ground of the truth, the means of grace, and the hope of glory.

[8] Cf. Professor E. A. Park's great Convention Sermon, "The Indebtedness of the State to the Clergy," the first in his volume called Discourses. Andover, 1885.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

If a stranger in New York City, walking with a friend past a well-known building, should inquire, on reading the words *Young Men's Christian Association,* "To what church does that belong?" the answer might be "to no church," or "to all the churches," or "to the catholic church." There would be a measure of truth in either answer but the last would be truest. Observe, by the way, that we sometimes diminish the size of objects when we begin their names with capital letters. "The Catholic Church" is a limited company, while "the catholic church" is universal. The same question and answers would apply to the headquarters of the American Sunday School Union in Philadelphia; or again to the Y. P. S. C. E. in Boston, whose catholicity appears already from the fact that its initials, like Y. M. C. A., need no

interpretation. But we cannot assume without challenge the meaning of the middle term, "the catholic church."

In the year 1910, a Commission was appointed to prepare a World Conference of the Catholic Church. It has worked steadily ever since; its product is large and valuable. At a meeting of its advisory committee (March 12, 1914), one of the eminent Bishops on that committee advised his colleagues thus:

"I think we ought to go right at work and get at a rock-bottom understanding of what the Church is." "If we can once get a grasp of what we can agree on as the Church, I think we can follow it out." "If we can get down first that we know ourselves what the Church is, and begin to agree as to what grace is, and as to what the functions of the ministry are, . . . we have the basis on which we can stand. The difficulty now is the shifting foundation, and we want to get down deep at the foundation to begin with."

The quotations are from page 30 of the Committee's report, and it appears from a careful reading of the whole report that several more years may well be spent in that special investigation.

"The Catholic Church comprises the whole company of the faithful, who have received the blessed sacraments at

the hands of consecrated men, who themselves received them from others, reaching back in an unbroken chain whose first link is the holy apostles of our Lord."

That is one conception.

"The catholic church comprises all who follow Jesus Christ."

That is another conception; and in this free land there is no good reason why the subject should not be freely discussed. Will the reader please be patient with the destructive criticism which must precede construction?

The other day I brought to Boston my brother Lambeth, who has the cheerful hope of uniting Christendom on the famous quadrilateral—bible, creeds, episcopate, and sacraments. As we stood before the statue of "Lincoln striking the fetters from the slave," I exclaimed: "The Spirit of the Lord was upon Lincoln when he proclaimed deliverance to the captives; when he let the oppressed go free and brake every yoke." "You forget," said Lambeth; "Lincoln was unsound on the Sacraments." We proceeded to the Public Garden, a miniature paradise, and with

gates, too, on the east, on the south, on the west and on the north. At one of the east gates, we looked into the grave, sculptured face of Edward Everett Hale. "There," I said, "is a beloved pastor, who administered the sacraments long and faithfully to young and old. Multitudes have been led to Christ by the book entitled *In His Name;* the hearty fellowship of its author in every good work is mirrored in the little book, *If Jesus Came to Boston.*" "He that is not with me is against me," said Lambeth; "Hale opposed the Historic Episcopate." We walked on to the south gate, where the statue of Charles Sumner stands on its pedestal. "A man after your own heart," I observed; "fed week by week on the Episcopal service in historic King's Chapel. Would that we could hear again that *inspiring* voice, which proclaimed liberty throughout all the land, to all its inhabitants, white or black. Would that we could see again the hero, who was such an *inspiration* to humanity." "Not to me," said Lambeth, gruffly; "he doubted the Inspira-

tion of the Scriptures." "But yonder," I replied, pointing to a west gate, "is a man who had no such doubts. He published eloquent tributes to the Bible. He was a venerated preacher, who ministered the word and the sacraments through a long life. When there were few to defend the equal rights of all men, he never quailed, but blazed a path for Sumner and Hale and Lincoln. Surely you will grant that the catholic church is well represented here by William Ellery Channing?" "Channing!" cried Lambeth in horror, and I thought he would have crossed himself; "why he wrote against the Nicene Creed!" Then we took our way in silence toward a north gate. "Here at last," said I, "is the catholic church incarnate. Look at that figure of the Good Samaritan. This is a monument to Doctors Morton and Jackson, discoverers of ether, that boon to uncounted millions. The Spirit of the Lord was upon them, because he anointed them to comfort those that mourn, to give unto them the oil of joy for mourning, and a garment of praise for

the spirit of heaviness." "Morton—Jackson," said Lambeth thoughtfully. "I must look them up, and I'll admit that they belong in the Catholic Church, if I find that they accepted the Quadrilateral."

There are two loyal members of the Church of England, who are public characters, and so may properly be used as types. They live at opposite ends of the earth; in this case, however, latitude does not count, for both were born in England and graduated at Oxford. So far as I know, they are equally faithful in their work, equally devout, devoted, and sound in the faith; but they hold contrary views respecting the catholic church. Stripping off their titles, after the manner of Carlyle in *Sartor Resartus,* we have remaining the names of Wilfred T. Grenfell and Frank Weston. At the sound of the first name, every reader smiles a happy smile and exclaims: "Ah, yes! the missionary doctor." At the risk of a severe reprimand from my old friend "on the Labrador," whose modesty is only equalled by his merit, I shall have to per-

sist in using his name as a type. At the sound of the second name, most readers give a blank, inquiring look. So the title must be restored: "Bishop of Zanzibar"; whereupon a few readers smile a peculiar smile and exclaim: "Ah, yes! Kikuyu." To be fair to both, we should restore Dr. Grenfell's title also, C.M.G. This means "Companion of the Orders of St. Michael and St. George," a distinction conferred only by the Sovereign of England, the head of its Church, and bestowed only on men who have been eminent in the service of humanity. Dr. Weston's title came to him, by tactual succession, from sundry ecclesiastics of the Dark Ages, and by hypothetical succession from others still more ancient. Thus he derives authority to sign his name "F. Zanzibar." But Dr. Grenfell is a bishop too; a real bishop with a small *b*.[1] A bishop is an overseer; and although the diocese in question is extensive, embracing the whole range of the Labrador with the adjacent coasts of Newfoundland, it is faithfully

[1] See p. 180.

covered by this watchman of the Good Shepherd. He heals the sick, and binds up the wounded, and preaches the glorious gospel in the pulpit and out, on sea and land, and (being an official justice) he smites with the rod of his mouth the wicked oppressors, even the sharpers and rum-sellers who would batten on the weaknesses or necessities of his poor people. The Spirit of the Lord is upon him, and great is his reward; a hundred fold now in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting. Dr. Grenfell is not only a bishop but a catholic (with a small *c*). He always communes as a fellow-worker with any one who loves the Lord Jesus Christ, whether it be the Bishop of Uganda or the humblest nurse-maid. Dr. Weston is a Catholic (with a large *C*), and thereby hangs the little tale of Kikuyu, a flourishing Scotch missionary station in East Africa. In 1913 it held a feast of tabernacles, when Christians of many names warmed each other's hearts, and finally celebrated together the Lord's Supper. Among the celebrants was the Bishop of

Uganda. Ay, there's the rub. For this was plainly uncanonical, in the view of the Head Christian of Zanzibar; who straightway posted to England, charged his brother bishop with heresy, and began the famous law-case of Z versus U, before the Archbishop of Canterbury. "There is no heresy as yet," said His Grace. "Go thy way for this time; when the chief captains shall come, I will know the uttermost of your matter." But there were wars and rumors of wars; and nation rose against nation, and the end is not yet; peradventure Kikuyu shall be trodden down of the Germans before the end come.

Let us now drop out of sight both Dr. Weston and Dr. Grenfell as individuals, and consider their types; which of these two, think you, was neighbor unto Christian Unity?

The types are extreme; may there not be a true middle way between them? So thinks our brother Arkansas, Bishop William M. Brown.[2] His major premise is that Church

[2] The Level Plan of Church Union. New York, 1910.

Unity will come when all bodies of Christians recognize each other in perfect equality; his minor, that those who hold the theory of grace transmitted by apostolic succession should be willing to bestow that grace freely on bishops to be chosen by all other bodies; that these other bodies should consent to choose their own bishops, and then should freely receive what is freely given. His conclusion is that in a single generation the Catholic Church throughout all the world would be a unit, and then the world would believe in Christ, according to John 17:21. The argument from that text will be noticed in another connection.

My only interest in the catholic church is in its relation to God's kingdom, as a means thereto, like the family or the calling. If I have read the New Testament right, I was a bishop at divers times; if I have misread it, I am willing to be set right. But there are two parts of Dr. Brown's scheme that are sure to fail. For first, he expects to persuade the Roman Catholics to depose the Pope, in order to unite with other Christians in electing a

super-Pope. Now the Catholics will never consent to play Hamlet with Hamlet's part left out. Unless we begin at the bottom, as I propose, the only way to combine with them is to begin at the top, as Dr. Brown proposes to do, but on the Lambeth basis instead of his own.

The other unworkable scheme of the Bishop is his "national Church" of the United States. In this country, that adjective and that noun do not belong together, any more than "blue death" or "holy war." The nation has physical bounds which the church will not respect. A criminal breaks over the line into Canada; unless his offence is extraditable, he is secure from our laws. But not from the church, which he has taken along in the person of his wife. She lays siege and captures his soul for Christ by the powers of love and sacrifice, which have prevailed since the days of St. John and the robber. (I hope my readers know the beautiful tale in Eusebius.)

Before passing from criticism to construction, let us turn once more to Bishop Rhine-

lander, who has compressed into half a dozen syllables a watchword for Christian unity that waves like Excelsior before the Lord's host: *"till all the race is one."* Has he not, however, put forth a loose dilemma; unity *or* union? Why not try for both though emphasizing the former? I labored long over the Bishop's ingenious illustrations before I saw their fallacy. "Two men together can cut a tree down faster than one man can cut it down alone"; that shows what we mean by union. "Branches broken from a tree will die"; that shows what we mean by unity. But the illustrations fail, because the work to which God calls us is to sow seed, and *we are one in spirit with the seed sown,* as Jesus declared: "that which is sown . . . these are they." We should have been sure, says Trench, to interpret the seed impersonally, but for Christ's own explanation. When the sower is alone, he sows in faith, because the life of Christ, which is the unity of the Spirit, is in him; and when two or more sow together, they have precisely the same

Spirit, it is God that worketh in them, both to will and to do of his good pleasure. Their Christian union is at the same time, for the same reason, and to the same degree, Christian unity.

The thought gives a natural transition to the positive, constructive part of this chapter. Without any claim to special wisdom on the subject, I simply state my own belief, and try to answer objections as they arise. "Since God is love, we ought also to love one another." "The catholic church comprises all who follow Jesus Christ." No one, therefore, is in the catholic church unless he is working for Christ; every such worker *is* in it; and all who are in it are working together, sowing the seed of the kingdom. This coordination becomes more and more manifest as the tides of the Spirit lift men above their clannishness and selfish isolation. The clearest and at the same time the largest example is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. One who studies its manifold labors cannot but be impressed with the

fact that the Divine Spirit is working in it, and that he works in unity as well as union. There is not the slightest authority there of Church over Church, or of all Churches over one Church or individual. It was the Spirit of Christian unity that drew them together before any union was formed. The activity of the Council is greatly underrated if it is thought to be limited to its national assemblies. One might draw that wrong inference from the name "Council"; as a matter of fact, there have been only two such meetings, one at Philadelphia in 1908, the other at Chicago in 1912. But all through the intervening years of each quadrennium, the Council is busily at work, not only counselling, but helping the weak to become stronger, and bringing the moral and spiritual power of the American churches to bear on various problems as they rise. This it can fairly do, because it represents at least thirty denominations and more than seventeen millions of Christians. It was this Council, for instance, that called on President Wilson to appoint the

day of prayer for universal peace, and that sent Professors Mathews and Gulick on the peace mission to Japan. It was this Council that was the organ of the catholic church in 1908, when at its great gathering it demanded justice and equity between employers and employed, pledging the churches, so far as it represented them, to stand for certain definite things, like the abolition of child labor and of the sweating system, for "the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be devised," and the securing to every laborer of one day's rest in seven. At the session of 1912, these demands were renewed and others were added, such as uniform divorce laws, the conservation of health, and "the protection of the individual and society from the social, economic and moral waste of the liquor traffic." A very practical way in which the Council becomes a continuous means of grace is through the proffer of its helpful advice when new fields are to be occupied, thus preventing the rivalry of denominations, the overlapping of several churches

where one is sufficient, and the far more serious and more prevalent evil of overlooking, and leaving ungathered, fields white for the harvest. As to the general outcome and promise of this movement, I quote the thoughtful words of Rev. James H. Garrison, Chairman of the Council's committee on correspondence.

"The value of this Federal Council is not to be measured by the work which it has accomplished and is accomplishing directly, large as it is, but rather by the atmosphere of catholicity and fraternity which it is increasingly creating, in which all its constituent bodies are enabled to carry on their work more effectively, and with greater and more direct bearing on the common interests of the kingdom. Religious leaders in all the churches are coming to see that those who best serve the kingdom of God best serve their own church. It is now manifest to all that this Federal Council is seeking, through the voluntary action of its constituent bodies, to manifest the unity to which we have already attained. The fact that federation may not in our judgment fully meet the ideal of unity which we believe the New Testament teaches, does not furnish any reason for withdrawing from it our approval and cooperation. God expects us to use what unity we have, and it is through the use of that that He is to lead us into a closer and more perfect union." A further account of the Federal Council will doubtless appear in Dr. Ashworth's forthcoming book: "The Union of Christian Forces in America," announced by the American Sunday School Union.

"But how vague is all this," some one ob-

jects, "this 'atmosphere of catholicity and fraternity.' There is no clear-cut, definite program here. We make no progress on such lines towards the One Universal Church which is our goal. Where is the head of this huge body?"

"There is none but Christ," I reply; "why should there be?" This continual demand for human headship rests on a false analogy. When Jesus said "the field is the world" he did not mean the military field, though the Bible sometimes uses military figures. If we have foes to fight we naturally desiderate captains and colonels and generals. But Christ's kingdom is not of this world. When we find that these "foes to fight" are just brothers to win, we proceed to win them one by one, without waiting for orders from any human superior. Nor did Jesus mean, by the field which is the world, the field of business; this detects the flaw in Bishop Brown's parallel. Because the trend of modern business reveals the need of ever more and higher grades of supervision and superintendence, he argues

that the churches of Christ should be similarly organized. But why? He would group them into dioceses, each with its Bishop, and these into national Churches, each with its great Head, and all the nations of earth into one Catholic Church, with some colossal mind at the top to sway the whole. But why? This looks more like an inclined plane than a level, but let that pass. It may be best for human welfare, though I doubt it, that all the industries on our planet should be swallowed up by one gigantic World Trust, but let that pass also. Our Lord had no such image in mind when he said: "Go, sow the field, which is the world." We meet the objector's question by asking: where is the head in a field of grass? The sun rises upon it, and a million tiny blades, tipped with dew, shine in its light. So let us shine; you in your small corner and I in mine.

"Still," pursues the objector, "you ignore the Lord's sacerdotal prayer in John 17:21. The world *cannot* be converted until all the people of God are brought together in one body with one spirit; for the very object of

this union is that the world may believe in Jesus Christ."

Here we meet again the bald, mechanical view of Scripture, as in the notion so current in the days of our fathers that the millennium cannot come until the Jews are restored to Palestine. John 17:21 may well pray to be delivered from its friends. One scarcely reads a plea for Christian union or unity which is not clinched by the argument just given in quotation marks.

But when Jesus prayed for the eleven disciples who stood or knelt around him, and for you and me and all Christians, that all might be one, in order that the world might believe, it was brotherhood he sought; he was not requesting from his Father some magical transformation in some distant age. The prayer was answered first at Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit of Unity was born in the disciples, and the world did believe, in three thousand representatives from the four quarters thereof. Instead of eleven in unity there were multitudes. By what means have these multitudes

multiplied, down through the ages even to our day, so that now, in the judgment of charity, we count them by tens of millions? By the Holy Spirit of love and sacrifice, is it not? or is it by canons and decrees of councils? These last have tended rather to strife and discord than to harmony and unity. How often we hear pessimistic churchmen sigh for the visible unity of the age of the great councils. Were half the breath thus vainly spent devoted to sincere, heart-to-heart grappling with the great unchurched, Christian unity would advance by leaps and bounds. Very slight and fragile was Christian unity in the councils of Nicæa and Ephesus. Jesus was in them not half so manifestly as in the labors of William Booth and Jerry McAuley and the humble men and women whom Harold Begbie pictures. It is there that the royal banners forward go; there we may read the meaning of Christian unity.

Take the other side of the question, for the sake of argument, and see where you come out. I was brought up to believe that Roman

Catholicism (popery, we called it) was antichrist, the scarlet woman, and the man of sin, all rolled into one. I learned better when I felt the Spirit of Christ in Catholic washerwomen, and in humble Catholic mothers who pray and strive to lead their children to the Lamb of God. Yet there are still millions of Protestants who share my original sin, and probably more millions over the line who hate us as heartily as we ever hated them. They are ready to fight to the death rather than join their heretical enemies. Are they more likely to be won by what is called a frontal attack or by the leavening power of love and sacrifice? Behind Catholicism stands the Greek Church. Ask it to forget its heroic past and swallow *filioque!* you wave a red rag before a bull. Attempts at external unity with these two Churches must not lose sight, by the way, of the fact that there are fifteen enormous candles in the so-called Holy Sepulchre, only six of which are in charge of those two churches. The Armenian, Syrian, and Coptic churches are "on the level," with three candles each,

while the Moslem guard makes strenuous attempts to keep the peace among them all. As is well known, a dispute between France and Russia about the "holy places," was the immediate cause of the Crimean war. Now suppose these "Churches" and all the rest are gathered by and by into one vast body. Is this what the wicked world has been waiting for? When the daily papers of London, New York, and Chicago shall announce in great headlines: "Ecumenical Ecclesiastical Unity Assured," then, as by one consent, the thieves and gamblers, harlots and thugs, drunkards and swindlers, will yearn for conversion, do you say? Why, they will not even know what has happened, though they all know the Salvation Army. If the headlines are explained to them, they will only curse the church; for it is not Christian disunity, but a carnal appetite, that leads them astray. They can be reclaimed as Five Points was reclaimed, but never by formal movements that begin at the top.

Whenever our old friend the pessimist fixes

his lugubrious eye upon our unhappy divisions,

> "He turns of a sudden exceedingly pale
> And sets himself down to weep and to wail." [1]

He might be thoroughly cured by putting him at work in the slums with a noble Jew and a godly Catholic. For after all he has a heart that would be touched with the infirmities of his brother Poles and Italians and Bohemians. Ere long the blessed work would engage all his energies, and he would become a new man in Christ Jesus, feeling like Wilberforce when he gave this answer to a pious friend who asked "How is your soul today?" "I have been so absorbed in those poor Africans that I had forgotten I had a soul." There is a rising tide of Christian unity which brings optimism to the faces of all who are working together with Christ. If the natural temperament of any such makes them look on the dark side, they just look back a little way—say, a century—at the poor little fringe of Christianity, mostly formal, which bordered then

[1] From Saxe's "Pyramus and Thisbe."

the great, black mass of infidelity and heathenism. Then they look around the horizon of the present, and with the joyful cry, "what hath God wrought!" they look off unto Jesus, and press toward the mark. The catholic church of today is full of faith in God and in her own great destiny, full of love that never faileth, full of hope in God's eternal promises, hope that is as an anchor to the soul, both sure and steadfast. Let Whittier voice it for us.

"In time to be
Shall holier altars rise to Thee—
Thy church our broad humanity.

A sweeter song shall then be heard—
The music of the world's accord,
Confessing Christ, the inward Word.

That song shall swell from shore to shore,
One hope, one faith, one love restore
The seamless robe that Jesus wore."

CHAPTER IX

THE KINGDOM

LINE upon line will prove, I trust, no vain repetition; for questions that are sure to come may as well be anticipated.

"What is your program? what would you have us do?"

Reply: Do all the good you can, and don't make any fuss about it (see page 73). Make two blades of grass grow where one grew before (see page 197).

"But what outlook for the future have we, unless we work together under common supervision?"

Reply: Leave the future to God. You are looking in the wrong direction. Look back a hundred years (page 202).

"But where there is such diversity of doctrine, the church cannot give a united testimony."

Reply: What of it? If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine. As Theodore Roosevelt has reminded us, that proposition is not reversible.

"But what is 'the meaning of Christian unity' when Christians go fifty different ways and do fifty different things?"

Reply: That is one of the subjects of this chapter.

The catholic church is large and potent, but it is only one of many provinces of the kingdom of God. Not a sparrow falls without our Father; and it makes a decided difference to the kingdom of God whether the sparrow falls from old age or from a cruel boy's gun. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is not a church; probably many who are active in its ranks are indifferent or hostile to the church; but the new spirit which the Society is infusing into the rising generation of American children is the Spirit of Christ, and so the Society belongs in his kingdom. There is in some minds, I grant, a confusion of terms, by which the word Church (with a large C) is stretched to cover all good things and all good people, even though the latter, who presumably know their own minds, protest against the classification. But no good thing or person is outside of the kingdom.

As one approaches the great metropolis, he observes that a group of its most prominent and lofty buildings are devoted to that factor of civilization which we call, for want of a better name, the daily press. We need not look back a century to find a time when such journals were cynically, and even bitterly, averse to anything Christian; one of the chief of them was constantly called "The Satanic." A large part of their revenues came from vicious sources; virtue and religion were treated either in a sneering or a patronizing tone. Something has wrought such a change that at present one of the most powerful agents for the uplift of the community and the world is the daily press. As a rule, with few exceptions, it stands for clean politics and human welfare. It is not the church, nor any part of it; the church is a highly efficient organ of the kingdom—it is no disparagement of the church to call it a conventional means of grace—; the press, like the school, is an unconventional means of grace, and it also belongs to the kingdom. We visit Printing House

Square, and then in succession a City Hall, an art museum, a university, a hospital, an academy of music, a play-ground, a bank, a market, a railroad. We remember (see page x) that Christ is to reign in politics, in art, in literature, in science, in commerce, etc. To perceive the connection of each of the objects visited with God's kingdom is a matter which may be left, for the most part, to the reader's own intelligence. Lest that should fail in the case of the last-named object, the railroad, I call attention to the part played in the early history of Christianity by the great Roman roads; over which the new religion spread so swiftly that all Christian authorities on that period agree in admiring the Providence that used these hostile powers to build such means of grace. Whenever the legions travelled along them, under orders to persecute the church, He that sitteth in the heavens cried: "Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith?" But far more swiftly, in this our day, the kingdom grows along the steam roads and the electric roads, while the

telegraph is what Bushnell called it, a road for thought.[1] Of course it must be conceded that every one of the agencies we are considering is religiously indifferent, in itself. A railroad, an art museum, a university, may sow tares instead of wheat. But the point to be insisted on is that, on the great whole, Christ's kingdom gains on the devil's, in each department of human activity; the stars in their courses fight for Deborah, not for Sisera. This we have seen in the case of the daily press, and it is readily shown in every case.

If ever philanthropy could have been divorced from Christianity, it would have been so within the massive walls which Stephen Girard erected as a castle to shield his orphans from the least infection of the faith he hated. Strange that so shrewd a bargainer, who strictly forbade the entrance of any clergyman to his college grounds, should have supposed that the porter could always distinguish a minister by his garb, or that honorable

[1] The whole essay on Roads in his Work and Play is well worth reading still.

ministers, in all time to come, would be aware of his absurd injunction. Strange that so keen an intellect failed to perceive that walls are no barrier to the wind that bloweth where it listeth, or to the Christian Spirit which breathes through a thousand unconscious agencies in every Christian city. The fact which forms a main contention of this book, that Christianity is spirit and not form (see pages v–xii), is well illustrated by Webster's famous argument in the Girard College Will case.

Let us now leave the fringes of the subject of this chapter and penetrate to the heart of it. Here, as well as anywhere, we may examine the charge (see page 62) that we misapprehend totally what Jesus meant by the kingdom of God, which was not a spiritual power, eternal and invisible, but a very definite earthly conception. The Messianic hope which he taught was the hope, it is said, of an apocalypse, or millennium; the conviction that Israel, beneath Messiah's sway, would dominate the nations, as in the glorious days of

David and Solomon, and that rebellious subjects would be cut off by the wrath of God revealed in fire from heaven. Then would the end come. With all deference to the able scholars who hold this opinion, it is of a piece with such investigations as we noted on pages 147, 148, and the proper answer, here as there, is "What of it?" We all know that the blessed kingdom which is now illuminating and elevating the world is the kingdom of love and peace; we all feel, this year, more strongly than mankind has ever felt before, the vivid contrast between that kingdom and the kingdom of force and violence. The former incarnates the spirit of Jesus, which is the spirit of self-sacrifice; the latter the spirit of Nietzsche, which sacrifices others to self. We believe, to be sure, in a final consummation; even science shows that this old earth is not to go on forever as it is; but the kingdom which Jesus taught us to pray for is the transformation of the spirit of earth into the spirit of heaven (see page 15). If there ever was another Jesus, who was so ignorant as to sup-

pose that the world, apart from a little remnant, was to be conquered by force, subdued by a stroke of almightiness, this is not the Christ whom we revere and whom we strive to follow; our Jesus Christ brings a gospel for all mankind, and sets the round world to singing: Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men. He is the only begotten Son of the God of love, and his kingdom is the kingdom of love that never faileth.

The reader who may object to so dogmatic a pronouncement is invited to study the masterly lectures of Professor Samuel Harris,[2] especially the chapter which contrasts the true idea of the kingdom with millenarianism.

The maxim that nothing succeeds like success is often used in the interest of Satan's kingdom; but it applies still more truly to the kingdom of God. Whether you look at it lengthwise, as it spreads through history, or breadthwise, as it spreads over the earth today, herein is a marvellous thing, that there should be such power in a mustard seed that the least

[2] The Kingdom of Christ on Earth. (Andover, 1874.)

of all herbs should supplant the cedars of Lebanon, such power in a bit of leaven that the quiet fermentation of the gospel should go on transforming the laws and customs, the business and fashions, of this old, wicked world. It is the Lord's doing; it is *his* kingdom.

Now and then, something of this process becomes visible to the naked eye. Lo, these are parts of his ways, but how little a portion is heard of him; but the thunder of his power who can understand? In the previous chapter, we looked in upon the revolving wheels of one of these divine factories, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Another such, of still wider scope, is the Edinburgh Missionary Conference. I say is, rather than was, for like the Federal Council, it has provided for the perpetuation of its Christlike work. Its transactions are open to all, through the nine volumes it issued,[3] eight of which give eight elaborate reports, which had been in preparation for two years by most

[3] World Mission Conference. Reports of the Commissions. New York, 1910.

fitly chosen men all over the world, on such themes as "Carrying the gospel to all the non-Christian world," "Missions and Governments," "Co-operation and the promotion of Unity," "The Home Base of Missions," while the ninth presents a brief history of the Conference, with its official records and the addresses given before it. The more thoroughly I study those reports, the more my conviction grows that this body—though without the shadow of a shade of authority—was the most truly Ecumenical Council that the kingdom of God on earth has ever known. The report on Co-operation and Unity, and the discussion that followed, revealed many gratifying examples of concord across denominational lines. It would be like the gracious Providence of our Father if those heathen nations who have received the gospel from us should teach their teachers the meaning of Christian unity. Let us be thankful that other missionary Conferences of this kind are in store for the future. For my part, I see not how a world Conference resting on the

principle of authority could be convened, without that surrender of our dearly bought freedom against which Paul warned us, saying: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage."

There is a marked resemblance between the essential aim of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, as Mr. Garrison phrased it (see page 195), and the message of Mr. Roosevelt to the Edinburgh Conference, as follows:

> "I believe that unity in a spirit of Christian brotherhood for such broad Christian work will tend, not to do away with differences of doctrine, but to prevent us from laying too much stress on the differences of doctrine. . . . If only we can make up our minds to work together with earnest sincerity for the common good we shall find that doctrinal differences in no way interfere with our doing this work."

Although the Conference was strictly a church body, it went outside the pale more than once to discuss questions belonging to the wider aspects of the kingdom. Thus on the day devoted to "Missions and Governments," when the horrible atrocities of the Congo rub-

ber trade were considered, a few judicial words from the President, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, evoked from every quarter the most spontaneous and tremendous applause of the entire eight days. The words were these:

'You will, I hope, leave behind you, as is suggested in the Report, some permanent body which will speak for you, which will hear what you have to say to it, will sift it in a sympathetic and straightforward manner, and having itself attained to the truth, if the truth is against the action of the Government, will, with one voice, leave the Government which is concerned no peace till it gets reform."

Exactly relevant to our subject is the interpretation of that storm of cheers by Dr. Gairdner.[4]

"It was as though a whole society of world-servants . . . were demanding to be given an articulate voice; a voice with which to make known its just desires and its just complaints, and with which, if it please God, to perform more faithfully and more effectually its office of tribune to a world of men.

"Was there not something else there too? Was it not as though the unborn babe of Unity Regained had strongly stirred in the womb? . . . the only corporate unity that would be worth having, the unity that is the expression of the desire of co-operation, the unity that is the Will to Live, and the Will to Act, *Together.*"

[4] Echoes from Edinburgh 1910. By W. H. T. Gairdner. New York, 1910.

The slow but steady development of what might be called a Christian race consciousness among Orientals gives a marked illustration of the diversity and independence in outward ways and things, which, on our view, may be expected to characterize the growth of the kingdom. The Eastern Christian is mentally and spiritually different from his Western brother, but the latter has too often sought to dominate the former, and to force his Christian development into Western moulds, with as little success as must always attend the effort to fit a round peg to a square hole. The original message of Christianity came from Orientals to Orientals. We Westerners, often unconsciously, have shaped the institutions of Christianity, age after age, in accordance with our prevailing habits of thought and feeling; we should hail with joy every visit of Eastern sages to our Lord, as they bring him their indigenous gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Let there be the natural unfolding of a native Christianity for the Arab race, another for the Hindus, another for the Chi-

nese. The essence and spirit of the gospel would be the same in all; but the tendency to preserve the individual traits of each contradicts, I believe, the probability of any form of external unity. The subject demands a volume for itself; it has been ably treated by Professor Moore of Harvard University and the late President Hall of Union Theological Seminary.[5]

If the kingdom of heaven is to follow the analogies of nature, which is also the kingdom of God, we ought to look to its past for homogeneity, and to its present and future stages for "a definite, coherent heterogeneity." Why should not we be satisfied with this goodly diversity instead of insisting upon a highly organized unity? To be sure, we "are bound to be dissatisfied till all the race is one" (page 68), but when the multitude of them that believe are of one heart and one soul, when the Holy Spirit of love makes them

[5] The Naturalization of Christianity in the Far East. By Edward Caldwell Moore. Reprinted from the Harvard Theological Review for July, 1908.

The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion. By Charles Cuthbert Hall. (See especially the last chapter.) New York, 1905.

one in Christ Jesus, we could not secure a higher unity and we need not demand a lower. It is the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. If the kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14: 17), the Christian world is so far from having already attained—peace, for instance—that all its energies are needed for this spiritual work. The progress of Christian unity, in any age of the world, is accurately measured by the growth of the kingdom in that age.

Looking back over the ways we have traversed in the practical part of this book, it is plain that all these paths converge to the one central idea of the kingdom of God. The Home tends to anarchy when God is left out of the family life; but the Christian Home is the kingdom of God in miniature and sample (page 80). The Christian School is an engine of mighty power in the great business of making the kingdom of God triumphant (page 97). In the chapter on the Calling we learned that the kingdom of God is a social

kingdom (page 117) and we considered the question how the various callings of men can promote that kingdom (page 123). The State is to become the brotherhood of man, synonymous with the kingdom of God (page 128). The Bible as a means of grace will continue its conquests until the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord (page 158). The local church fulfils the prophetic ideal of the kingdom, giving light and saving life (page 161). The catholic church has its only reason for being, in its ministry to the kingdom (page 189). All these are simply organs (or means) of grace, while the kingdom is grace itself. But as it is the very nature of grace to go forth in loving ministry to its object, so the divine grace that centres in the kingdom is ever flowing back to bless the Home, the School, the State, and all. The ebb and flow of the tide would give but a feeble analogy; the kingdom of God is the supreme organism (page 101), whereof each part is at the same time the means and the end of all the rest.

If the kingdom is thus the central power in humanity, what is the central power in the kingdom? Surely the King himself; our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. On his head are many crowns; nothing human is foreign to the sphere of his peaceful conquest (page 207). Of him and through him and unto him are all things. Since he is all-sufficient, we need no pope or super-pope, whether as mediator or as titular head. Paul was looking unto Jesus when he sent to his poor converts, and to us also, the glad message of the four *alls* (II Cor. 9:8): "God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all-sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work."

CHAPTER X

RETROSPECT

THIS chapter is designed to be both a summary and a supplement; to review the course of the argument and to strengthen it here and there. The title of the book—the meaning of Christian unity—is taken in two senses; the idea of Christian unity, and what it means to us. The former is the subject of Part First. Christ prayed that all his people might be one; that is, that the Holy Spirit might dwell in them and work through them in ever growing power. His teachings, which are abundant and clear, are in full harmony with this interpretation. Other interpretations have been held, but no attempt is made here to examine them in detail.

Part Second investigates the practical side of Christian unity, and this discloses a bewildering variety of opinions. As the reader may have perceived, I have no great rever-

ence for bibliographies. They are useful to candidates for the doctorate, but the majority of our fellowmen are still, perhaps, outside that category. Any one who wishes to peruse a hundred and fifty volumes bearing on our chapter VII will find them listed in Mr. Elliott's "Making Good in the Local Church" (see above, page 170). A selection, rather than collection, of books relating to chapter VIII appears at the end of Bishop Brown's "Level Plan" (above, page 188). This has the merit of indicating, in the case of each book, the standpoint of its author. See also A Bibliography of Topics related to Church Unity. By the Rev. F. J. Hall, D.D. (a pamphlet to be had of Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me.). Another important list, which serves to illustrate chapters IV and V, especially the former, is in Dr. Vedder's recent book.[1] If there are readers who desire a few thousand volumes germane to the other chapters of Part II, they can ob-

[1] The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy. By Henry C. Vedder. New York, 1914.

tain them by consulting the United States Catalogue (found in all leading libraries) under such titles as Family, Home, Education, Teaching, Bible, Christian Life, Christianity, Kingdom of God. It has seemed preferable to give references as they naturally came up in the progress of the book.

Returning, then, to the Cardinal Precept (Part I, Chapter I), I make grateful mention of Dr. Swete's book noted below,[2] the rather, as it furnishes a welcome vindication of the use of the Fourth Gospel as authentic (above, page 62). Dr. Swete is not only a Professor in the University of Cambridge, but also, as all scholars know, he has stood for many years in the front rank of biblical critics; it needs only to mention, among various contributions, his standard edition of the Septuagint and his critical commentaries on the Gospel of Mark and the Apocalypse of John. Professor Swete is willing to concede that in some early passages of the Fourth Gospel, reflections of

[2] The Last Discourse and Prayer of Our Lord. A Study of John XIV–XVII. By Henry Barclay Swete. London, 1913.

the Evangelist himself have so blended with the words of our Lord that it is difficult to distinguish them. But after long and careful study of these closing discourses, together with the prayer in Chapter XVII, he is convinced (page x) "that they approach as near to the words actually spoken by our Lord as the memory of one who heard them can bring us. . . . I cannot escape from the feeling that a greater than the greatest of the Evangelists is here." Swete, like Godet (above, page 44), is inclined to drop the word *one* before *in us* in John 17:21. His remarks on verse 23 show that he shares the common view of the effect of external Christian unity upon the world, on which I commented in Chapter VIII.

We pass on to Chapter II. An excellent book on the Lord's Prayer is a modest volume containing a series of sermons by Dr. William Walter Woodworth (Boston, 1891). The meaning of Christian unity is brought out in his comments on "Our Father."

In speaking of the Parables (Chapter III)

allusion was made (pages 33, 54) to the study by James Stirling: "Christ's vision of the kingdom of heaven." As it is a leading thesis of my own book that Christian unity *is* the kingdom of heaven, I call especial attention to his grouping of all the parables (he makes them twenty-nine in number) under six classes, each presenting a different aspect of the kingdom of heaven. A still later book, *Jesus and His Parables,* by George Murray (Edinburgh, 1914), contains an important section on The Course of the Kingdom, pages 216–272, compare Section 3, Fellowship with God the Ideal, pages 174–215.

This last thought, Fellowship with God, adds one more synonym for Christian unity to those I have mentioned in Part I, Chapter IV, "The underlying harmony of Christ's teachings." More might well be made, than is made there, of a negative fact which emphasizes that harmony; namely, that Jesus is almost totally silent on the subject of organizing his kingdom into a body politic. The word *church* he uses only twice. "Tell it

unto the church," in Matthew 18: 17, relates to such local gatherings as the Jews had long known. "Upon this rock I will build my church," in Matthew 16: 18, followed immediately by the bestowal of the keys in verse nineteen, was not spoken to Peter alone; see 18: 18, itself made universal by 18: 19, 20. The fellowship in God of united Christians has been in every age the key to open the kingdom of heaven; and conversely, they who participate in the spirit of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the brotherhood of love, illustrate, just in the degree of that participation, the meaning of Christian unity, which embraces all men potentially and all Christians actually.

At the outset of Part II, I have discussed the true point of view for considering the practical part of the subject. Christian unity is to be furthered, not by clamping church bodies together, for their internal friction would be heightened instead of cancelled. Nor is it by reducing such bodies to their lowest terms, and uniting the residue, for thereby much that is valuable in each would be lost.

Nor is it (probably) by combining what all regard as their most distinctive features; there is danger that unchristian elements would appear in the corporate result.

Instead of beginning at the top, as all these theories do, we should begin at the bottom, each Christian loving his neighbors with sincere devotion and winning them thus to Christ, and all these Christian neighborhoods gradually blending and expanding, until the whole world would become a fellowship of brothers. This was Christ's simple program; it has never been thoroughly tried, but it is never too late to carry it out. There are helps, close at hand, in what may be called the unconventional means of grace.

First, the home. We put the emphasis in the wrong place when we ask what we can do to help the home; say rather, what can the home do to help the kingdom? It is a mistake that is even worse to emphasize the degeneracy of the modern home; there are multitudes of genuine Christian families, each one the salt to preserve and the light to

illumine the community. The best work for the kingdom is done for children and youth in their own homes, where are implanted feelings and habits of reverence, dependence, trust, obedience, culminating in faith, hope and love. We should beware of obstructing the proper work of the home by calling away its members so often to less imperative forms of Christian service.

From the home the normal child goes to the school, but does not step thereby outside the sphere of the kingdom. A vast number of children, who never come under the sway of the means of grace at home, are reached and moulded for good by the Christian atmosphere of the school. A healthy discipline is there, for those who would otherwise miss it; order, application, manliness, democracy, characterize these centres of young life. Individual traits are not toned down and obliterated, but developed rather to their truest expression. Education, in its inmost meaning, is genuinely Christian, as the greatest educators have testified.

"The kingdom of God grows like a tree, ever assimilating new material" (page 105). The home and the school are not its only feeders. God calls us all to our daily work, desiring no drones in his hive; and so that daily work, a trade, a profession, or what not, is our calling, an unconventional means of grace. The one principle to regulate and elevate the relations of all employers and all employed is found in the precept: "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." Nothing is settled until it is settled right; God requires truth in the inward parts. Envy and inefficiency on the part of workmen are fatal to the progress of God's kingdom; so are injustice, pride and tyranny in the employing class. The Christian public should never sit down at ease until fair dealing prevails on all sides; then will God's kingdom come and his will be done in earth as in heaven.

We come next to the State, whose relation to the Church has been the theme of perpetual disputes. Neither of these two has any inde-

pendent authority; both are God's ministers for the ultimate end of his kingdom. A State, for instance, can demand the service of its subjects, and also their lives, which it is cruelly sacrificing even now by the hundred thousand; but after that it has nothing more that it can do, whereas the kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. The State, according to its true conception, is humanity organized for government; it is the political organ of the brotherhood of mankind, and it is a blunder as well as a crime for one State to prey on another. Out of the present turmoil will emerge a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness; for humanity sweeps onward to the one future certainty; namely, that the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdom of our Lord.

The Bible may be regarded in different aspects, but all must agree that it is a powerful means of grace. It finds us at the greatest depths of our being, and through its touch of Spirit it makes the whole world kin. God is in it and man is in it; they are not in opposi-

tion, as is falsely assumed by those who would exalt or disparage either, but in conjunction, and that too of so intimate a kind, that the product resembles less a physical mixture than a chemical combination. The unique majesty of the Bible becomes most impressive when we ascend to its loftiest mountain peak and behold the glory of redemption in the face of Jesus Christ. Here we find the true meaning of Christian unity, for the whole race will be one when and only when it is one in Christ.

The local church is another means of grace. It is its blessed mission to save life; the whole life, in all its phases and in all its powers. No single method, as that of the revivalist, or that of institutional machinery, should limit its activities; like Terence, it should count nothing that belongs to man to be foreign to itself. Christian unity is impossible on any narrow ground; but every true church is engaged in large and universal enterprises which directly promote that unity, such as the Sunday School, the preaching of the gospel,

the development of Christian character in the whole social life of the community. The function of the church is inspirational, and the spirit it inspires is that of hearty, universal brotherhood.

The subject of the catholic church brings us face to face with two clashing opinions as to the very nature of the church; the one going back to a supposed apostolic succession, the other embracing in the church all who follow Christ. The feasibility and flexibility of this latter conception is exemplified on a large scale by the wide activities of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The other conception is exemplified in a document lately issued by the Bishop of Zanzibar.[3] I quote literally, without comment, from these proposals.

"6. The Council shall not allow members to raise questions affecting the Christian ministry and sacraments, nor interfere in any way with represented Churches in their views of the same. (See Note 4.)

7. The Council shall take no share in any policy by

[3] Proposals for a central missionary Council of Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches in East Africa. By Frank Weston, D.D., Bishop of Zanzibar. London, 1914.

which Communicants of any one represented Church shall receive Holy Communion in another Church. (See Note 4.)

NOTE 4. § 6 and 7. These clauses safeguard the dogmatic position of each Church and Society. The strict observance of them will enable men who think with me to sit upon the Council; while the disregard of them would result in many of us severing ourselves from those who had set them at naught.

This is a hard saying; but, in fact, it only means that some of us are so sincerely convinced of the Episcopal position that we feel bound in honour not to surrender it. And we expect the members of non-Episcopal churches to feel as strongly about their own several positions.

Let us each be strict in observing those points for the sake of which we feel compelled to keep the Church in disunion."

As all roads once led to Rome, so all the means of grace which we have found to promote Christian unity have their centre in the kingdom of God (see pages 218, 219). Nothing in all history has succeeded like the success of that kingdom, whether one considers its extent in time or in space. Slowly but surely it is realizing a more vital Christian unity. Christians go fifty different ways and do fifty different things; they are severed by continents and seas, and they have no central organization; but so long as they hold the Head,

they have not only the hope but the fruition, day by day, of that exceeding great and precious promise: It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

I call attention, in closing, to a volume entitled *The Catholic Conception of the Church*.[4] The very fact that it holds a diametrically opposite position to my own (for it defends the Anglican theory of apostolic succession) makes more significant its general agreement on the nature of the kingdom of God. This kingdom, according to Dr. Simpson, is the sphere over which God presides.

> "The phrase Kingdom of Heaven conveys to the modern mind an idea of unearthliness and futurity which is entirely absent from the phrase itself, and which it would not have conveyed to our Lord's contemporaries."

It is an existing fact, he says, present in germ, future in consummation; imperfect now, perfect hereafter. It is not merely individual, but also and especially social; a social institution on earth; a community of men (pages 1–10).

Here, and not in the author's conception of

[4] By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. New York, 1914.

the Church, lies a genuine basis for Christian unity.

For as soon as we ask: "how large is this 'community of men' designed to be"? we come back to the all-inclusive love of our Father in heaven, who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, who so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son. Protestants though we be, we join from the heart in the hymn of a sweet singer of the Romanist faith:—

It is God; His love looks mighty,
But is mightier than it seems.
'Tis our Father; and His fondness
Goes far out beyond our dreams.

There's a wideness in God's mercy
Like the wideness of the sea;
There's a kindness in his justice,
Which is more than liberty.

For the love of God is broader
Than the measure of man's mind;
And the heart of the Eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

INDEX

INDEX

American Sunday School Union, 180
Ames, C. G., The Lord's Prayer, 18
Armenian, Coptic and Syrian Churches, 200
Ashenhurst, J. O., The Day of the Country Church, 170, 177, 178
Ashworth, R. A., The Union of Christian Forces, 195
Athletics, disciplinary value, 94
Autocracy, 126

Baby-story theory of the Bible, 144
Balfour, Lord, of Burleigh, 215
Bancroft, G., History of the United States, 130
Beatitudes, The, 26–30
Beecher, W. J., as biblical critic, 142
  The Prophets and the Promise, 42
Begbie, Harold, and reformed men, 20
Bernard, T. D., The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ, 3
Bible, The, 141–160
  as a game of chance, 150
  its power, 158, 159
Bible, The, a means of grace, 151
  what is it? 146
Bible classes for men, 175
Biblical criticism, 62, 141–151
  precepts, how far binding, 149
Bibliographies needless, 124, 222
Brahmanists and Buddhists, self-surrender of, 16
Brotherhood is to transform the world, 9
  of man is the kingdom of God, 128
  versus strife, 124, 198
Brown, W. M., The Level Plan of Church Union, vii, 188–190, 196, 197, 222
Bunyan, J., The Jerusalem Sinner Saved, 52
Burns, R., Poem, 94
Bushnell, H., Christian Nurture, 76, 77
  Happiness and Joy, 39
  Work and Play, 208
  quoted, 174

Calling, The, 105–124
Calvinism and the Christian consciousness, 9
Capitalists, how serve God's kingdom, 110–112

Christian emblem, fishing not hunting, 38
spirit in politics and literature, x, xi
Christianity and the Cities, 137
Oriental, 216, 217
Church, the Catholic, 180–203
a means to the kingdom of God, 189, 205
theories of, contrasted, 181–190
true theory of, 192–201
Whittier on, 203
Church, the Local, 161–179
and revivalists, 168, 169
and sociability, 171, 172
as parish, 164
in a factory village, 178, 179
life in the world, 177, 178
uniform methods wrong, 166–174
varieties, 163–165
Churches yoked, 172
Churchill, W., The Inside of the Cup, xi
Comenius, J. A., The Great Didactic, 91, 102
Congo Rubber atrocities, 215
Conventional means of grace, 141–220
Cox, S., The Book of Job interpreted, 110
Cuyler, T. L., as a pastor, 169

Dickens, C., novels alluded to, 14, 72
Dike, S. W., views on the family, 73, 74, 85
Divine begetting, 147
Du Bois, W. E. B., The Philadelphia Negro, 135
Duties depend on doctrines, 61
true point of view, 62–71
Dykes, J. O. books on the Kingdom, 47

Ecumenical unity futile, 201
Edinburgh missionary conference, 212, 213
Education and individual traits, 95
is religious, 101–104
Elliott, E. E., Making good in the Local Church, 170, 222
Emerson, R. W., shot fired at Concord, 144
Eschatology, 209–211

Faber, F. W., Hymn, 235
Federation of Churches, 192–195
Fellowship with God, 225
Fishing, a Christian emblem, 38
Forgiveness and the rule of three, 21
Fremantle, W. H., The World as the Subject of Redemption, 36
Froebel, F., Education of Man, 103

Gairdner, W. T. G., Echoes of Edinburgh 1910, 215
George, Henry, land tax, 122
Girard College, 209
God in business, 106

God, most men believe in, 106
not a great man, v
Godet, F., on John, 44
Government, municipal, 133
Greek Church and Unity, 200
Grenfell, W. T., and catholicity, 185–188

HALL, C. C., The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion, 217
Hall, F. J., Bibliography, 222
Hallam, Arthur, and Tennyson, 95, 96
Happiness and joy, 39
Harris, S., The Kingdom of Christ on Earth, 211
Hickok, L. P., Moral Science, 131, 132
Home, The, 72–88
beneficent activity of, 88
industrial pressure against, 83
is society, 74
leavening power of, 75
like living tissue, 75, 76
pushed aside, 84
Home training, elements of, 79, 80, 85
Hopkins, M., The Law of Love, 56
Humanity is the Kingdom of God, 45
complex, x
enthusiasm of, 41
Humility unites men, 27

ISLES of Shoals, 161

JEFFERSON and civil liberty, 136
Jeremiah, his greatness, 154
Jerusalem and Philadelphia, 133–136
Jesus Christ, central teaching, 3, 4
culmination of teaching, 4
foundation of concord, iii
harmony of teachings, 42–58
his program, 9
frustrated by pride, 70
separate sayings 36–41
silence concerning organizations, 57, 225, 226
summary of teachings, 57
supremacy, 158, 220
teachings, as related to Unity, 3–58
Job, the Book of, 108–111, 153, 154
John's Gospel authentic? 62, 223
connects Paul with Sermon on the Mount, 4
does not ignore the Kingdom of God, 54, 55
Jonah, the Book of, 155
Judge-advocates, 144, 145

KIKUYU, 187, 188
Kingdom of God, 204–220
and evolution, 217
includes all life, 205–207
not apocalyptic, 209–211
not unearthly, 234

LABOR problems, 108–123
unions, 117–121
Ladd, G. T., What is the Bible, 151
Lambeth in Boston, 182–185
Lanier, S., The Crystal, 156
Longfellow, H. W., The Saga of King Olaf, 29, 30

Lord's Prayer, 11–24
each petition links with "Our Father," 18
Love, the law of, 56
Lowell, J. R., The Present Crisis, 140
Luke, the Gospel of Humanity, 54

Magna Charta, 129, 130
Mark's Gospel, the Seed growing secretly, 53
Matthew's Gospel and the Kingdom of God, 45–53
Maurice, F. D., The Lord's Prayer, 12
Mayflower, The, 130
Meekness not weakness, 29
Milton, Paradise Lost, 126
Mohammedan literature, 156
Montessori, M., The Montessori method, 103, 104
Moody, D. L., remark on the minor prophets, 112
Moore, E. C., The Naturalization of Christianity in the Far East, 217
Moses and the giving of the Law, 143
Murray, George, Jesus and His Parables, 225

Nashville Conference, 64
National Church not feasible, 190
Nature not a goddess, ix

Objections anticipated, 61, 62, 89, 129, 204, 205
Oppenheimer, F., The State, 128

Parables, The, 30–35
of grace, 31, 32
of judgment, 32, 33
of the mustard-seed and the leaven, 34, 35, 211, 212
Park, E. A., Convention Sermon, 179
Pessimist's view of church divisions, 202
of the family, 80, 81
Pestalozzi, J. H., Swan Song, 102, 103
Pope of Rome, not to be deposed, 190
Prayer, highest form of divine service, 25
the Lord's, 11–24
the Pharisee's, v
Precept, the Cardinal, 3–10
Press, the daily, 206
Pride separates men, 26
Promise, not promises, 42

Quadrilateral, 182, 185
Quakers, or Friends, viii

Religion, source in the home, 76
Retrospect, 221–235
Rhinelander, P. M., on Unity, 67, 68, 157, 191
Riis, J., Peril and Preservation of the Home, 86
Robertson, J., Early Religion of Israel, 145
Roman Catholicism and the Church, 200
Roosevelt, T., message to Edinburgh Conference, 214

Sacred includes secular, 79

Saxe, J. G., Pyramus and Thisbe, 202
School, The, 89–104
  even for those who have good homes, 91
  public, unifies, 92–95
Scoffers at religion, 163
Sects like sectors of a circle, vii
Shema, the first great commandment, 40
Simpson, W. J. S., The Catholic Conception of the Church, 234
Sinai, Mount, 131
Social problems, 123
Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 205
Spencer, I. S., A Pastor's Sketches, 107
Spirit versus form, vii, xii, 209
State, The, 125–140
  defined, 132, 133
Stirling, J., Christ's Vision of the Kingdom of Heaven, 33, 54, 225
Storrs, R. S., Jr., The Divine Origin of Christianity, 35, 36
Strahan, J., The Book of Job Interpreted, 110
Sunday School, The, 174–176
Sunday School Times, The, and biblical criticism, 142
Swete, H. B., The Last Discourse and Prayer of our Lord, 223, 224
Swift, J., Gulliver, vi

Teacher versus warrior, 97
Thaxter, C., Among the Isles of Shoals, 162
Tremaine, D. C., Church Efficiency, 165, 175, 177
Trench, R. C., Notes on the Parables, 49, 191

Unconventional means of grace, 72–140
Unity *and* (not *or*) Union, 191
  Christian, among Christian workers, 20, 202
  and schism, 63
  by addition, not subtraction, 65
  defined, iii, 57, 58, 68, 225
  a goal, not an achievement, 9
  independent of forms, ix
  inward and unobtrusive, 67, 90
  not Church Unity, v
  not metaphysical, 8
Unity, Christian, a present fact, 68
  related to the Bible, 157, 158
  a thing of degrees, 57, 58
  two aspects, xii
  the way to obtain, iii
Unity, confessional, inadequate, xii
Universalism, early and later, 6, 7, 58

Vedder, H. C., The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy, 222

War, the great, iii, 15, 62, 126, 127, 132, 138

Webster, D., Girard College Will Case, 209
Weston, F., and catholicity, 185–188, 232, 233
Whittier, J. G., Hymns, viii, 203
Williamson, J., History of Maine, 162
Wilson, W., governs on Christian principles, x
The State, 127
Woodworth, W. W., The Lord's Prayer, 224
Woolman, John, representative Friend, viii
World conference of churches, 64–66, 181

YOUNG Men's Christian Association, 180
Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, 180


Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01017 4904